DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 213 151 EC 141 102

AUTHOR	Schwartz, Henrietta, Ed.
TITLE	The Dean's Grant Monograph 1979-1980.
INSTITUTION	Roosevelt Univ., Chicago, Ill. Coll. of Education.
PUB DATE	80
NOTE	99p.
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC04 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Attitude Change; *Curriculum Development; *Curriculum Evaluation; *Disabilities; Educational Philosophy; Elementary Secondary Education; Faculty Development; *Federal Programs; Higher Education; Knowledge Level; Multicultural Education; *Preservice Teacher Education
IDENTIFIERS	Deans Grants Program; Education for All Handicapped Children Act; Roosevelt University IL

ABSTRACT

Twelve papers address the accomplishments of the Dean's Grant project at Roosevelt University (Chicago, Illinois), designed to evaluate and revise curriculum for preservice education students in accordance with compliance to state and federal mandates regarding education of the handicapped. Entries have the following titles and authors: "The Role of Special Education in The 1980's--An Existential Question" (P. Bates); "The Five "A's" Dean's Grant--An Overview" (H. Schwartz); "Historical Perspectives of the Dean's Grant" (M. Showalter); "Faculty Change in Areas of Knowledge and Attitudes Towards the Handicapped" (C. Lynch, G. Olson); "Public Law 94-142--The Mandates and the Schools" (G. Diamond); "Public Law 94-142--Implications for Inservice Education" (W. Hazard); "Some Thoughts Concerning the Current State of Public Law 94-142 and Our Secondary Schools" (C. Orear); "Public Law 94-142--Changing the Philosophy of Education for the Handicapped" (M. Reynolds); "Response to Illinois House Bill 150 and the Proposed Certification Standard on Multicultural Education" (H. Schwartz); "Gleanings on Mainstreaming--A Report of Visits to Seven Deans' Grants Projects" (J. Burleigh); "Documentation and Evaluation of a Dean's Grant" (G. Olson); and "Proposal for a Clinical Experience--Resource Catalog in Special Education" (B. Sherman). (SB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED213151

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

George Olsen

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

THE FIRST YEAR MONOGRAPH
1979 - 1980

PREFACE

The Role of Special Education in The 1980's:
An Existential Question ..... *Percy Bates* 1

THE DEAN'S GRANT

The Five "A's" Dean's Grant: An Overview ..... *Henrietta Schwartz* 5

Historical Perspectives of The Dean's Grant ..... *Miriam R. Showalter* 10

Faculty Change in Areas of Knowledge and Attitudes
Towards The Handicapped ..... *Cynthia Lynch, George Olson* 16

FEDERAL AND STATE LAW

Public Law 94-142: The Mandates and The Schools ..... *George P. Diamond* 27

Public Law 94-142: Implications for Inservice Education ..... *William R. Hazard* 40

Some Thoughts Concerning The Current State of Public Law 94-142
and Our Secondary Schools ..... *Crag Orear* 48

Public Law 94-142: Changing The Philosophy of Education
for The Handicapped ..... *Maynard C. Reynolds* 54

Response to Illinois House Bill 150 And The Proposed Certification
Standard on Multicultural Education ..... *Henrietta Schwartz* 67

DEAN'S GRANT OUTCOMES

Gleanings on Mainstreaming: A Report of Visits
to Seven Deans' Grants Projects ..... *Judith Burleigh* 71

Documentation and Evaluation of a Dean's Grant ..... *George Olson* 81

Proposal for a Clinical Experience: Resource Catalog
in Special Education ..... *Bernard Sherman* 85

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Many people assisted in the preparation of this monograph. Many hours of editing and copy readings were most efficiently and thoughtfully handled by Dr. Curtis C. Melnick, Director, Teacher Corps Project.

Most valuable secretarial services were provided by Diane Cahue, Michele Fagin, Hope Hickman, Jura Jakatys, and Dyhan Slaughter.

We thank you all for your assistance in the preparation of this monograph.

5 A's Dean's Grant
Project Staff

THE ROLE OF SPECIAL EDUCATION IN THE 1980'S*
AN EXISTENTIAL QUESTION

Percy Bates
Deputy Assistant Secretary for Special Education and
Director, Office of Special Education, U.S. Department of Education

Special educators have historically had the ultimate responsibility for educating handicapped children and youth. The enthusiasm and dedication that this responsibility has generated among us has been central to our success as a profession and to the attainment of educational opportunities for handicapped individuals.

A decade ago, special educators, parents, and advocates were struggling to make needed changes in attitudes and legislation and monetary appropriations. We were struggling to find ways to equalize educational opportunities for all children to ensure quality in the education of handicapped children. This struggle lent great meaning to our work and enhanced our sense of identity as a profession and as individuals. It also propelled the advancements that have now been achieved.

During that earlier period, we had a sense of mission. We had a real cause, a cause that others eventually joined with us. We took risks and made commitments to this cause. In a sense, we took an existential leap. The risks we took and the commitments we made enriched and deepened the meaning we experienced in our lives and in our work. This was indeed the magic of special education. We became what we stood for. We were united as a real profession with a genuine sense of purpose and responsibility.

All of this culminated in November, 1975 with the enactment of Public Law 94-142. This was a pinnacle of achievement for special educators and

---

* Reprinted from Counterpoint 1, 1980, 3.

advocates, a challenge for regular educators and the public schools, and a long-awaited statement of rights for handicapped children and their parents. In a certain sense, the cause had apparently been won. What remained then--and what remains now--is the task of translating that victory into reality for public education.

Writing in more universal terms, Kierkegaard described the twentieth century as the century of "the day after Christmas feeling." What he meant was that societies in the western world are now born into an era in which the major causes have been won, but, with all the technological advancements, physical and material securities that have been accrued, something else has been lost. What has been lost, according to Kierkegaard, is man's sense of meaning and identity. It is on the issue of universal and personal meaning that existential philosophy rests.

In the years since the passage of Public Law 94-142, our profession may also have experienced a "day after Christmas feeling," a feeling that the struggle is over, the cause has been won, and a simultaneous sensation that our identity and purpose have somehow been diminished. Amid the enthusiasm for Public Law 94-142, I perceive a general lack of direction in special education. Through the law, we are now able to provide the kinds of services that special educators and parents have long wanted for handicapped students. On the other hand, new questions have been raised about the role of special education in the development and delivery of these services. There is uncertainty everywhere among special educators as to what they are now supposed to be doing. They often feel like a fifth wheel in the public schools; they no longer understand exactly how and where they fit in. The sense of mission is disappearing.

In the earlier days, our roles were clear. We were in demand, and we were committed. More recently, the distinctness of our position has been blurred; we are no longer clear about our current roles and future directions. There is

a general notion that special educators should become support personnel who no longer carry the total load, but not even that possibility has been defined with any real clarity. To move from the position of sole provider and champion of the cause to the position of partial provider and extra appendage in the educational system is a tremendous identity change, and not at all an appropriate one for special educators to make.

In many ways, this problem reflects general problems of collaboration. The intent of the law was to develop partnerships among special education, regular education, and many related interests in behalf of handicapped students. This is the spirit of the comprehensive system of personnel development at the state and local levels, and it is a spirit that should pervade all that we do. But we have been so preoccupied with the actual implementation of the law that we have not really worked on partnerships. Regular education inservice programs and preservice preparation have gone forward, but the necessary linkages and collaborative efforts have more or less stood still. The immediate and important task before us is to work out partnerships with regular education without eroding the commitment and enthusiasm of special education.

We have survived for many years on the basis of our commitment and our enthusiasm. Without these attributes, we could be in serious trouble as professionals. If people feel that their contributions have been minimized and are less valued than before, then the magic of special education will be lost. If that magic is lost, then the handicapped will really be short-changed.

The quality of education that is provided to these students should be our emphasis. To achieve that quality, we must prepare ourselves to play important, divergent, yet interlocking roles, not reduced and unimportant ones. We should never convey the idea that the special educator's contribution is not an important one.

As handicapped students enter more and more into American education, the expectation should continue that special educators are responsible for what happens to these students. When something becomes everyone's responsibility, it can also become no one's responsibility. We need to strike a balance between the contributions and responsibilities of regular education and special education in the singular effort and opportunity that we can share. To do so, we must develop the cooperative spirit that will bring all of education into equilibrium.

Within this partnership, we must also renew our understanding that special educators' responsibilities continue to be major, not minor. This is my personal commitment and also a commitment of the Office of Special Education.

The existentialists tell us that meaning does not just exist out there to be plucked like a flower. They say, instead, that people must create their own meaning through believing in and affirming something so strongly as to enable the selfless involvement, commitment, and risks that make life and its endeavors meaningful. For those of us in special education, the day after Christmas has not arrived. The real goals are still to be achieved. The meaning has not and cannot disappear from our lives and from our work.

THE FIVE "A'S DEAN'S GRANT, AN OVERVIEW

Henrietta Schwartz
Roosevelt University

In May, 1979, the Research and Development Center of Roosevelt University was awarded a Dean's Grant through the Bureau for the Education of the Handicapped (BEH). The principal goal for the project was to evaluate and revise curriculum for preservice education students in accordance with the needs that resulted with compliance to state and federal mandates. As recipients of this grant the College of Education undertook three major tasks: re-examination of its present teacher education programs, retraining regular education faculty in areas of knowledge and attitude towards the handicapped and the development of provisions for appropriate revision of preservice education programs in order to better prepare teachers for mainstreamed classes.

The perceived outcome of the faculty retraining process was twofold. One, to develop increased levels of knowledge and positive attitudes towards the handicapped by the college faculty; two, to retrain the College of Education faculty to change attitudes of teacher education students towards the handicapped, as well as, providing them with the necessary skills for individualizing instructional programs.

The main objectives of this paper are to:

1. Describe the procedural format for the faculty retraining process.
2. Analyze faculty profiles in terms of demographic characteristics, knowledge and attitude.
3. Discuss assessment techniques utilized to ascertain the faculty's level of knowledge, attitude and needs.
4. Discuss the impact of the retraining process through data analysis and informal assessment techniques.

5. Discuss implications for further faculty retraining programs in institutions of higher learning.

The basic assumptions of the project are shown below:

1. Group living implies imposition. If one is to live in a group, there are certain acceptable constraints on behavior which are learned in the home, in the community, in the school, in the peer group and in the workplace. Much of this cognitive and social behavior is transmitted by the chief institutional socialization agent in our society--the school. Therefore, the school should design and implement programs which assist each child in expressing his uniqueness, but also to assist the child in learning those things which make for a relatively smooth transition to productive adulthood.
2. As all cultures are the same and yet each is different, so each individual in a society is the same as every other person and yet each is different. Schools, in responding to this commonality and uniqueness, have instituted programs of individualized instruction, diagnostic-prescriptive teaching, least restrictive environments--mainstreaming, etc. There is no universal sure fire treatment or prescription, but it is assumed that there are common elements in each educational program which can be identified, programmed and taught to teachers.
3. The participants in our project reflect the same commonalities and diversities of any group. Therefore, the Roosevelt University program must feature appropriate universals and specifics to accomplish meaningful professional development.

Given these starting points, the Dean's Grant staff conceptualized the program as a developmental sequence of rational, articulated experiences to enhance faculty competence in training teachers to work with handicapped youngsters. First, an extensive needs assessment was done looking at the knowledge skills

and attitudes of faculty participants. Then the staff planned experiences to allow participants to move individually through the five "A's" developmental model. They are:

Awareness - Understanding of the law; an appreciation for, and open attitude toward, the problems of educating the handicapped; knowledge of the various handicapping conditions. (Readings, William Hazard, George Diamond, observations, discussion, feedback on tests)

Access - Knowledge of various techniques for the identification and diagnosis of handicapping conditions; understanding of the mainstreaming concept. (Literature, Showalter and faculty, vocabulary, tests, skill acquisition--sensory responses)

Appropriateness Ability to plan an appropriate individual educational prescription and administer treatment to redress educational deficiencies. (Work with expert practitioners, research projects, doing IEPs, preliminary university curriculum review)

Assessment - The skill, knowledge and ability to objectively evaluate the programs designed to train teachers to work with handicapped students in public school settings. (Intensive examination of curricula, revision, implementation and evaluation)

Accountability - The willingness to be judged on the quality of performance by the teachers, administrators, counselors and other professionals trained by the faculty to meet the needs of the handicapped. (Follow-up of graduates, request feedback, correct self and program, and continue professional development)

The Management Information System (MIS), developed in the summer of 1979, was designed to attend to the five developmental stages described above. This system has three major characteristics: (1) it defined the two broad goals and eight major objectives and related tasks of the project; (2) it tentatively tested the persons responsible for each major task; and, (3) it set time-lines for the accomplishment of each task. The MIS also served as a valuable information tool. It provided both formative and summative pictures of the status of the project.

The procedures were to (1) collect baseline data; (2) synthesize the data; (3) develop an appropriate program format; (4) re-evaluate program effectiveness; and (5) revise program when needed. This process allowed for a logical and sequential system for developing, monitoring and evaluating the impact of the training program.

The framework for this procedure included four methodologies: quantitative, ethnographic, historical and managerial analysis. These four methodologies will be explained in the paper.

Seven faculty members from diversified programs within the College of Education were participants in the first year's project. In order to develop a training program that was based on individual needs of the faculty, as well as determining in quantifiable terms the program's impact, the following data sources were utilized. They were: (1) interviews with each faculty participant to determine individual needs; (2) pre-and post-test analysis of levels of knowledge and attitude on the following scales: Rucker-Gable, SoC Questionnaire, and a Knowledge Scale derived from Project Retool: (3) analysis of the Level of Attainment Scales; (4) faculty products; (5) consultation with other universities or colleges with Dean's Grants; (6) Visits to other Dean's Grant Projects by faculty participants; (7) Management Information System.

The data generated by these various sources allowed the staff to evaluate not only the cumulative effect of the Project but periodically to check on program effectiveness throughout the year allowing for revision where necessary.

The findings for the first year's Project are in the process of being compiled. From preliminary analysis, several inferences can be made. At the onset of the retraining process in September, 1979, the faculty participants were fairly consistent as a group in identifying individual needs from the project. The level of knowledge, as measured by the Rucker-Gable Scale, indicated from the pre-test that there was fairly high faculty consensus on placement of handicapped children in appropriate mainstreamed classrooms. This consensus was also within the range set by the norms. Six of the seven participants made professional contributions to the Project's monograph at the year's end, indicating level of involvement invested beyond that required. All faculty participants made site visits to other institutions involved in Dean's Grants, with written reports submitted. These results are both incomplete and tentative; complete findings will be presented and analyzed in future papers.

The impact of major federal legislation in the field of special education, particularly Public Law 94-142, has important implications not only for teacher preparation in special education, but for programs that prepare teachers for regular classrooms at all levels as well. Before the latter programs can be evaluated and revised, faculties in colleges of education will be obliged to undergo staff development to provide them with the knowledge and skills requisite for a revised mode of teacher preparation for a new clientele.

The findings from this research will provide information data for all institutions of higher learning involved in teacher education preparatory programs.

HISTORICAL PERSPECTIVES OF THE DEAN'S GRANT

Miriam R. Showalter
Roosevelt University

The history of concern for handicapped individuals is characterized by pendulum swings from humane to punishing treatment. The handicapped individual who was regarded with tolerance as a "heavenly infant" in one era was the ancestral brother of one who had the "devil beaten out of him" in another era.

Blatt (1974) states that "in the beginning, humans were created and then humans created the criteria for being human."

The ancient Greeks contemptuously labeled the retarded "idiots," a term meaning peculiar. In infancy idiots were permitted to perish from neglect; as adults they were persecuted. The early Christians gave basic care to deviants. A backward step occurred in the late middle ages, and the individual not created in what was thought to be the image of God was cursed and might be tortured or sacrificed. The harsh treatment of those whom nature did not favor continued through several centuries with the first attempts at educating coming early in the 19th century with individuals and widely spaced small groups. Progress toward consistently humane and enlightened treatment was not rapid. The early 20th century was noteworthy for the attempts to find measuring devices and to identify and classify, and to segregate in human warehouses, according to Hewett (1974).

The modern era of concern for the handicapped came after World War II and was initiated by parents of handicapped children. Special classes were established and children who differed in intellect, social behavior, sensory function, physical traits, or emotional stability were separated into special classes. This was not always because teachers felt that this was the most desirable placement, but sometimes was occasioned by the teacher comfort factor, the flip side of what is being called teacher stress in popular parlance today.

Historically there have been four common ways in which society has dealt with deviancy, according to White and Wolfensberger (1969). These have been to prevent, reverse, segregate or isolate, and destroy it. Laws which permit sterilization of institutionalized mentally retarded, mentally ill, and epileptics are still on the books in several of our states. The unceasing search for medical cure is seen in such breakthroughs of information that high dosage of oxygen in incubators was the cause of retrolental fibroplasis causing an overage of blindness between 1939 and 1954. The development of immunization methods for dread diseases such as poliomyelitis, rubella and mumps, which may leave their serious residuals on the lives of many who are afflicted, are examples from the modern era of attempts to prevent handicapped conditions. Medical advances in the field of genetics have achieved a method to reverse the course of phenylketonuria, to control a high percentage of seizuring associated with many disorders, to permit use of residual hearing, and to allow the orthopedically handicapped to become more functional in society.

We still isolate the deviant in warehouse institutions far from urban centers under the guise of sheltering him from society, though the trend is toward small community homes. Parents who feel that they are being punished by their God may still isolate a handicapped individual by tying him to a bedpost, or keeping him in a closet for many years. Nazi euthanasia constitutes a recent illustration of attempts to destroy the handicapped. A recent newspaper article tells the story of an administrator of a home for the severly handicapped who punished a 13 year old epileptic for making incoherent noises in church by binding her in a straitjacket and suspending her from a wall in a padded cell. The "treatment" resulted in death.

The massive move to segregate the handicapped in special classes and schools continued unabated until the late 1960's. One herald of change appeared in 1968 in an article by Dunn (1968) whose article articulated the unstated and

discomforting fears of many educators:

> The purpose of this article is two-fold: first, to provide reasons for taking the position that a large proportion of this so-called special education in its present form is obsolete and unjustifiable from the point of view of the pupils so placed; and second, to outline a blueprint for changing this major segment of education for exceptional children to make it more acceptable. We are not arguing that we do away with our special education programs for the moderately and severely retarded, for other types of more handicapped children, or for the multiple handicapped. The emphasis is on doing something better for slow learning children who live in slum conditions, although much of what is said should also have relevance for those children who are labeled emotionally disturbed, perceptually impaired, brain injured, and learning disorded.

The time was ripe for change. From Scandinavia there was news of the benefits of "mainstreaming" and "normalization." Mainstreaming referred to a return to the regular class for all children for whom this was possible, either on a full or part-time basis. Normalization implied that the total lifestyle of the handicapped individual was to be as normal as possible.

Change was occurring in the area of treatment of the handicapped. The sense of failure with existing systems of service delivery was happening at a time when the humanistic, equal rights, and accountability movements were converging.

Out of these concerns came new legislation. In Illinois, mandatory legislation ensured the education of all handicapped in 1969. Colleges and universities began their scrutiny of offerings in preservice teacher preparation as they geared up to implement this bill. Illinois HB 150 (1979) mandates successful completion of course work in exceptionality by all future teachers so that they may function effectively in mainstreamed classrooms.

The enactment of federal legislation, in particular, PL 94-142, the "Education for all Handicapped" bill offered to public schools, colleges and universities an unparalleled opportunity for reversing the errors of the past intervention systems with the handicapped.

The basic rights established by PL 94-142 are outlined as follows by

MacMillan (1977):

1. The right to due process, which protects the individual from erroneous classification, capricious labeling and denial of equal education.
2. Protection against discrimination testing in diagnosis, which ensures against possible bias in intelligence tests used with ethnic minority children.
3. Placement in an educational setting that is the least restrictive environment, which protects the individual from possible detrimental effects of segregated education for the handicapped.
4. Individual education program plans, which ensures accountability by those responsible for the education of the handicapped.

PL 94-142 commits funds for use in teacher inservice education. In addition, the appropriate education of preservice teachers is included in its mandate and funds to achieve this goal are made available through projects known as Dean's Grants. The College of Education, Roosevelt University was awarded a Dean's Grant on June 1, 1979. A second year cycle of the Dean's Grant began in June, 1980 and included retraining activities for an additional group of faculty fellows.

The primary purpose of the Dean's Grant project is to retrain College of Education faculty so that they may re-examine and revise the preservice teacher education programs in order to provide students with knowledge, attitudes and strategies appropriate for successful teaching in mainstreamed classrooms.

Awareness, Access, Appropriateness, Assessment, and Accountability are the 5A's of the Roosevelt University Dean's Grant. The project is conceptualized as a developmental sequence of rational, articulated experiences to enhance faculty competence for training preservice students to work with handicapped individuals, with each of the A's representing a step in that

retraining through which faculty members (fellows) will progress individually.

Seven faculty fellows volunteered to commit 10% overload time to Dean's Grant activities during the school year, 1979-80. Knowledge and attitudes of the fellows toward handicapped individuals and the law were measured using the Rucker-Gable Educational Programming Scale, Hall's Measuring Stages of Concern About Innovation, and a knowledge and attitude questionnaire. In addition, an individual interview was held with each fellow. Group and individual retraining experiences were planned based on information derived from assessment.

Faculty fellow retraining included lectures by experts in aspects of exceptionality and the law, field trips, seminars, films, and reading of selected literature. Each fellow has made a trip to another Dean's Grant institution to learn how the implementation of PL 94-142 was accomplished.

In order to determine the level of preparedness of Roosevelt graduates to teach in mainstreamed classrooms, surveys were conducted of alumni and student teachers using criteria of successful teaching based on the competency clusters which were identified by the National Support Systems Project.

Preservice curriculum re-examination began with revision of objectives of preservice secondary and elementary programs. Consensus was reached on 14 common objectives, and instructors for each course were asked to distribute 100 points across these objectives in order to determine which were receiving attention. Decisions will be reached in regard to necessary curricular inclusions and revisions at subsequent faculty retreat sessions.

The project has produced a resource bibliography, a management plan for the program, a set of resource papers related to guest speakers of national reputation who have addressed the faculty, and a faculty manual for research projects related to the education of the handicapped.

A particularly strong feature of the program is the evaluation component. Using a multiple methodology model within the framework of transactional

evaluation designs, the data generated by the participants will be used as a basis for decision-making in the project and summative evaluation. Findings of the first year of the project will be disseminated.

Presentations have been made by staff at conferences in Chicago and Louisville, Kentucky.

Bibliography

Blatt, B. "A Short Prejudiced History." Mental Retardation. August 1974, 59

Dunn, L.M. "Special Education for the Mildly Retarded -- Is Much of it Justifiable?" Exceptional Children. September, 1968, 35, 20-36.

Hewitt, F.M., and Forness, S.R. Education of Exceptional Learners. Boston: Allyn & Bacon, Inc. 1974.

MacMillan, D.L. Mental Retardation in School and Society. Boston: Little, Brown and Company. 1977.

White, W.D. and Wolfensberger, W. "The Evolution of Dehumanization in Our Institutions." Mental Retardation. June, 1969, 5-8.

FACULTY CHANGE IN AREAS OF KNOWLEDGE AND ATTITUDE TOWARDS THE HANDICAPPED

Cynthia Lynch and George Olson
Roosevelt University

Introduction

The Dean's Grant Project for the academic year 1979-80 had as one of its primary goals the development of an appropriate and comprehensive faculty retraining program. The program was designed to enhance the participants' awareness in areas of knowledge and attitude towards the handicapped. The retraining of Roosevelt University's College of Education faculty was intended to assist the staff in re-examining and revising the preservice programs in order to provide students with appropriate knowledge, attitudes and strategies for successful teaching in mainstreamed classrooms. The retraining process was conceptualized as part of the 5 A's sequence for the entire project: Awareness, Access, Appropriateness, Assessment and Accountability, a developmental sequence of rational, articulated experiences designed to enhance faculty competence. Reported below are the pre-and post-test results of faculty responses to three separate instruments employed to assess change in knowledge and attitudes towards the handicapped.

Methodology

Seven faculty members participated in the eight months retraining program. The faculty were representative of the following program areas: Guidance and Counseling, Elementary Education, Secondary Education and Reading. Each faculty fellow was assessed at the inception of the program in September, 1979, and then re-evaluated in May of 1980. The format for the retraining process was based on a needs assessment obtained through individual interviews and pre-test data provided by three evaluative instruments. The instruments utilized were: The Rucker-Gable Educational Programming Scale (Rucker, Gable, 1974), SoC, Measuring

Stages of Concern About Innovation (Hall, George and Rutherford, 1979), and Training Needs Diagnostic Profile, TNDP (North Carolina Project Retool, 1979).

The Rucker-Gable instrument is a 30 item scale with each item supplying a brief description of a child with a certain type of exceptional characteristic. The 30 items include descriptions of 10 learning disabled, 10 emotionally disturbed and 10 mentally retarded children. On the basis of the information presented the respondent was to rate the most appropriate learning environment for each child. A continuum of seven placements was available, ranging from regular class placement to full-time placement in a special setting.

The SoC Scale is a measure of a respondent's level of reception to innovation and change. The questionnaire contains 35 items that cover seven levels of concern: Awareness, Information, Personal, Management, Consequence, Collaboration, and Refocusing. The rating scale is based on a range of 0 - 7, representing items that the respondent feels are "not true of me now," "somewhat true of me now" and "very true of me now." Public Law 94-142 was inserted in place of the innovation so the content of the questionnaire became more specific in relation to faculty retraining.

The TNDP is a self evaluative took of one's perception of one's skills and knowledge in the following areas: Content, Development, Research, Administration, Teaching and Service. For each of the 101 items, respondents choose one of four choices for each item: "possesses little or no knowledge/skill, possesses some knowledge/skill, possesses a great deal of knowledge/skill, or this area is irrelevant to my work responsibilities."

The faculty retraining program afforded the fellows an opportunity to develop increased awareness and knowledge of the handicapped through diversified approaches. Exceptionality, legal mandates and remedial techniques were investigated through various site trips to institutions servicing the handicapped, guest lectures by experts in respective fields, films, workshops, and the like.

Results

The Rucker-Gable Programming Scale

The Rucker-Gable Scale measures the ability of participants to place handicapped children with particular problems into appropriate settings. For this project it was basically a pre-and post-measure of the application of knowledge concerning a variety of handicapping conditions in children. The Rucker-Gable Scale was not useful in determining attitudes since such interpretation required a large sample of respondents and very similar knowledge level within the participant group. Pre-test scores revealed rather wide range in experience and knowledge with respect to characteristics of the mentally retarded and emotionally disturbed child, as well as knowledge of learning disabilities.

Comparison of pre-and post-results for the group on all 30 items showed little change in ability to place children. On the pre-test, respondents placed children correctly in 63% of the situations presented and on the post-test in 61% of the situations. In observing the responses within the three categories (mentally retarded, emotionally disturbed, and learning disability), little change was also noted in any category. Highest knowledge was indicated in the emotionally disturbed category (70% correct answers), and least knowledge in the mentally retarded category (56% correct answers). The results suggest most need for further training emphasis in knowledge and placement of the mentally retarded.

The lack of change in pre-and post-test measures may be explained in part by the relatively high level of ability of participants entering the training program. In addition, a further reason could be the rather high level of sophistication required to correctly diagnose and place a high percentage of children based upon a very limited amount of information. Knowledge of the characteristics is one competence level that can be demonstrated; diagnosis and recommended treatment is another. It may be unreasonable to expect performance close to the level of experts in the field after a one year training experience. A focused

effort on application of the knowledge learned may be required even of professionals with considerable knowledge in other educational fields.

The SoC Questionnaire

Table I depicts the results from the SoC questionnaire. Mean ratings by participants for each of the seven categories are displayed for the pre-and post-test responses. For each category participants responded on a 0 - 7 scale indicating "not true of me now" (0 - 2), "somewhat true of me now" (3 - 5), to "very true of me now" (6 - 7). There were 5 questions per category, and each category will be discussed based upon mean responses by participants to the questions in each category.

Table I
Pre-Post Ratings
SoC Questionnaire

Category	Pre-Test (Mean Group Score on scale of 0 - 7)	Post-Test (Mean Group Score on scale of 0 - 7)
Awareness	1.8	1.2
Information	4.6	3.7
Personal	4.3	3.7
Management	2.6	2.3
Consequence	5.9	6.1
Collaboration	5.3	5.9
Refocusing	4.3	4.5

For the Awareness category, items were stated in terms of non-awareness. A low numerical score indicated a high awareness. Pre- and post-measures went from 1.8 to 1.2 (Table 1) indicating high awareness to begin with and an even higher awareness after training.

Information items similarly stated a lack of knowledge and desire for more information about P.L. 94-142. A mean response of 4.6 (pre-test) indicated that the absence of knowledge and strong desire to learn more about P.L. 94-142 were

"somewhat true" of participants. After training, the mean score dropped to 3.7 indicating that knowledge had increased and desire to know more had decreased.

One observes the same appropriate magnitude of change for the Personal category. Items in this category referred to a desire to know how changes toward compliance with P.L. 94-142 would affect one's professional status, the decision-making structure, one's teaching and the like. A decrease indicates a firmer basic knowledge of how mainstreaming will change one's situation.

Management items refer to one's inabilities or lack of confidence to manage one's responsibilities, one's time, etc. Participants felt such items were not true of them before and after training. Little change was indicated.

Items referring to Consequence indicated a concern with how P.L. 94-142 would affect students' attitudes, evaluation of students and the like. Participants expressed high concern on both pre-and post-measures.

For the category of Collaboration, participants showed an increase from "true of me now" to "very true of me now." Items in this category assess the extent to which persons want to work together on topics or issues related to mainstreaming.

The final category, Refocusing, indicates a desire to see how programs could be redesigned and refocused to obtain better results, in this case as a result of P.L. 94-142. Results indicate a healthy concern for this aspect, one that increased slightly after training.

Interpretation

A summary of these responses is informative about the concerns and attitudes of the participants upon entering the program and some possible benefits of the training. When faculty began training activities, they were aware of P.L. 94-142 issues, they recognized an information gap in themselves they wanted to fill, they recognized some individual discomfort with some issues, they believed they could manage their own situation quite adequately regardless of changes imposed

by P.L. 94-142, and they were amenable to some refocusing that would need to take place. Basically, the attitudes of this group were positive towards the law and its implications for them personally and professionally. Post-test results revealed that the training enhanced their positive tendencies:

- Participants became more aware and involved.
- They obtained the information they desired.
- They felt better able to cope with personal issues potentially raised by the law.
- They felt their management capabilities increased.
- They showed a heightened concern with the consequences of the law, but also a greater willingness to collaborate about problems and solutions.
- They were a bit more amenable to refocusing of efforts to deal with changes that might be required.

In all instances, one observes a positive shift. Collectively these indicate greater knowledge, concern and confidence in dealing with problems of mainstreaming.

The Training Needs Diagnostic Profile (TNDP)

The TNDP consists of 102 items broken into six categories. The number of items per category, raw scores, and average ratings per category are shown in Table II.

Respondents have indicated their own assessments of the extent of their knowledge in each category at the beginning and end of the first year of training. By virtue of the fact that over half of the items are devoted to Content, the average ratings for this category are most significant in indicating change related to training. Content items cover child development, psychological aspects, sociological aspects, biomedical aspects, methods, instructional materials for citizens with special needs, legislation and significant organizations. As displayed in Table II, mean ratings increased from 1.9 to 2.3 on a 3 point scale.

This indicates a modest positive gain in knowledge and/or skill, broadly spread over a number of different content areas.

Table II
TNDP
Pre-Post Trials
N=7

Area	Number of Items	Mean of Raw Scores	Mean Rating	Mean of Raw Scores	Mean Rating
Content	53	103	1.90	122	2.30
Development	8	14	1.75	16	2.00
Research	10	27	2.70	25	2.50
Administration	10	25	2.50	29	2.90
Teaching	9	21	2.33	22	2.40
Service	12	25	2.10	24	2.00

The area of Administration shows a similar gain in magnitude. This category dealt with program planning, needs assessment and evaluation. According to the ratings, well developed entry skills of participants (high pre-test ratings) were enhanced during the period of the training. Nearly all participants responded on the post-test survey with the highest rating possible for the Administration items.

All other categories show little change either positively or negatively. The Development category (as used by this project) referred primarily to test development, which was not a major concern of the first training year. Research skills were a major training concern. Each participant designed and completed a project of research related to a particular interest in the field of special education. Since respondents assessed very highly their entry skills in research (2.7 on a scale of 3), large gain scores were impossible. As shown in Table II, there was instead a slight decrease in self-assessed skill in research knowledge and/or skills.

One could hypothesize that participants were able to assess their knowledge

and skills more accurately after their experiences in the training program. This could account, in part, for the fact that in a majority of the categories little positive or negative change was shown. There is some evidence in favor of this hypothesis. For all the categories there is considerable increase in agreement among respondents on ratings of post-test results when compared to pre-test results. The means of the post-test scores were, therefore, not only more representative of the group than were the pre-test scores, but probably were more accurate as well. While changes were negligible in some cases, the exit levels of assessment, if accurate, were at least satisfactory in all categories (no mean ratings were less than 2.0). Mean self assessments of 2.3 - 2.9 on a scale of 3 were more than satisfactory and reflect positively on the training effort.

It is impossible from these data alone to state that such levels have resulted directly from the training received. It is reasonable to conclude, however, that participants have a better grasp of their own capabilities in the areas assessed.

Summary and Discussion

Results of the Rucker Gable revealed no significant gains in general ability to place special children into appropriate environments; gain was noted in one category, the Emotionally Disturbed. If knowledge can be inferred from this test of application, the results indicate that additional information about Mentally Retarded children is needed by the trainees. Since this was a test of application, however, such inferences will need verification in other data sources such as interviews or specific tests of knowledge.

The SoC results showed most positive self assessed gains in the Information category. Gains of similar magnitude were shown in Awareness, Personal (views) and Collaboration. In no category was there a negative change. This instrument attempted to assess participants' dispositions to innovations and change in

programs as a result of the advent of mainstreaming. Thus, it could be argued that the assessments are also a good indication of attitudes towards P.L. 94-142 and its anticipated impact. The results suggest that participants had fairly positive attitudes towards the law and its implications at the beginning of the training, and that these positive attitudes had increased by the end of the first training year. Additionally, results indicated that knowledge increased positively in the areas previously indicated, i.e., Information and Awareness.

The TNDP results support the indications of increased knowledge and awareness by showing positive gains in the Content area. They indicate also rather high self assessments of knowledge and skill levels in the areas of Research, Administration and Teaching. The areas of Test Development and Service show the lowest self assessed levels of knowledge and skills. If these are deemed important areas for training, they should be considered weaknesses of the program in need of some future emphasis and experience.

It is important to point out at this point that results from the three instruments discussed represent the quantitative measures employed in a multiple methods approach to program evaluation. In addition to quantitative measures, pre-and post-interviews were conducted, a project history was written based upon a content analysis of documents and records from meetings, events, products and the like, and a management information system was used that was designed to keep the project on track and on schedule and to provide documented evidence of completion of stated project objectives. While it is beyond the scope of this report to present all analyses, some general corroborative information can be shared.

The interviews reveal high positive feelings about the project, ones which increased throughout the program. These support the contention that attitudes were positive and became more positive throughout the project. Participants also believed that they were learning a great deal and in many cases reported

that they did not know the extent of their unfamiliarity with special education in general and with the law specifically. This supports the suggestions that self-assessments of knowledge, skills and attitudes in subject areas in which one is not knowledgeable may be inaccurate. Thus, change scores may not have reflected true gains in learning; they may have underestimated them. In this case, interview data did suggest a higher cognitive gain than did quantitative test results.

Management Information System documentation revealed a close adherance to planned schedules and completion of all project objectives. Historical analyses consistently portrayed high participant satisfaction. An important milestone identified was the completion of the participant's research studies as a positive culmination to the project's first year. This event was viewed by participants as the completion of a comprehensive and worthwhile effort.

From these supporting data it appears that the modest gains indicated by the instrument data need to be contrasted with the dramatic gains indicated by the more qualitative data sources. While all types of data gathered indicate very similar trends, a more valid assessment of impact due to training is likely to be obtained when multiple data sources are considered.

It is generally accepted that a total reliance upon quantitative measures is limiting. It substantially reduces the amount and scope of descriptive information that is available through more qualitative measures. In nearly all quantitative assessments of projects such as a Dean's Grant, as many questions about the process (and outcomes) are raised as are answered. For example, questions were raised about the reasons for negative changes over time, and the need for more information concerning cognitive gains in knowledge. While the quantitative results reported are useful to project operations, they are by themselves incomplete.

Based upon an assessment of the instrument data alone, one might suggest

that more quantitative measures be imposed on the participants in order to measure directly the cognitive gains in knowledge and to subsequently introduce more objectivity into the assessment of impact. With the exclusive use of such methods, however, there is usually a tradeoff; and it is a negative tradeoff in projects such as the Dean's Grant, in which a high sense of collegiality, self-direction and faculty participation is required. The extent to which participants will be accepting of strict cognitive measures is an important factor to consider because of the destructive rather than constructive effect such measures can have on a desirable learning climate. Indications are from this project that the multiple methods approach gathers the needed information in a palatable and non-threatening manner. It emerges, therefore, as a highly successful implementation and evaluation strategy for Dean's Grant projects.

PUBLIC LAW 94-142
THE MANDATES AND THE SCHOOLS

George P. Diamond
Roosevelt University

Prior to the 1970's handicapped children were often the victims of discrimination in terms of identification, evaluation, and placement. Consequently, the doctrine of due process emerged as the legal principle upon which much of the litigation in special education has been based. This litigation in turn has resulted in the incorporation of due process provisions in both state and federal legislation.

In 1971 the United States Senate began an effort which has had great consequences for services to the handicapped. An attempt was made to amend the Civil Rights Act to recognize that handicapped citizens have civil rights, too, and thus to prohibit discrimination on the basis of handicap. The spirit of that amendment was included in a final section, Section 504, of the Rehabilitation Amendments of 1973 (Public Law 93-112) providing:

> "No otherwise qualified handicapped individual . . . shall, solely, by reason of his/her handicap, be excluded from the participation in, be denied the benefits of, or be subjected to discrimination under any program or activity receiving federal financial assistance. (Federal Register, 1977)

Final regulations for Section 504 were published May 4, 1977. One of the first cases which has relied on Section 504, Hairston v. Drosick (1976) very simply stated what the law requires:

> "The exclusion of a minimally handicapped child from a regular public classroom situation without a bona fide educational reason is in violation of Title V of Public Law 93-112, "The Rehabilitation Act of 1973," 29 U.S.C. 794. The federal statute proscribes discrimination against handicapped individuals in any program receiving federal financial assistance. To deny to a handicapped child access to a regular public school classroom in receipt of federal financial assistance without compelling educational justification constitutes discrimination and a denial of the benefits of such program in violation of the statute." School officials must make every effort to include such children within the regular public classroom situation, even at great expense to the school system.

In regard to procedural safeguards the Section 504 requirements are:

"A recipient that operates a public elementary or secondary education program shall establish and implement, with respect to actions regarding the identification, evaluation, or educational placement of persons who, because of handicap, need or are believed to need special instruction or related services, a system or procedural safeguards that includes notice, an opportunity for the parents or guardian of the person to examine relevant records, an impartial hearing with opportunity for participation by the parents or guardian and representation by counsel, and a review procedure."

Following the 1971 decision in the Pennsylvania Association of Retarded Citizens (PARC) and the 1972 decision in Mills, a bill was introduced in the United States Senate in 1972 to expand the federal role in regard to procedural safeguards in the education of handicapped children. Many of the provisions in the court decisions were reflected in Public Law 93-380 passed in 1974.

In the Education Amendments of 1974 (PL 93-380), the Congress ordered an immediate assurance from the states that procedures were in place to guarantee that all handicapped children within each state and their parents are assured of procedural safeguards in all decisions regarding identification, evaluation, and educational placement.

As summarized by LaVor (1977):

"These amendments also included vital guarantees of the educational rights of exceptional children and their parents, such as an assurance of due process procedures and assurance of education in the least restrictive environment. Also of great significance in this legislation was the requirement that each state establish a goal of providing full educational opportunities for all handicapped children within each state, along with a comprehensive blueprint and detailed timetable toward the achievement of that objective."

On November 29, 1975, President Gerald Ford signed into law Public Law 94-142 --The Education for All Handicapped Children Act. This legislation committed the federal government to a most substantial financial contribution toward the education of handicapped children. It also refined and strengthened those educational rights that had originally received attention in PL 93-380. Moreover, PL 94-142 is permanent legislation with no expiration date. This is in stark contrast to normal Congressional procedure.

The intent of this legislation is perhaps best expressed in a passage from the

law itself:

> "It is the purpose of this Act to assure that all handicapped children have available to them . . . a free appropriate public education which emphasizes special education and related services designed to meet their unique needs, to assure that the rights of handicapped children and their parents or guardians are protected, to assist States and localities to provide for the education of all handicapped children, and to assess and assure the effectiveness of efforts to educate handicapped children."

The requirement necessary to meet the procedural safeguards guaranteed through both PL 94-142 and Section 504 is stated in the Section 504 provision for procedural safeguards:

> "Compliance with the procedural safeguards of section 615 or the Education of the Handicapped Act is one means of meeting this requirement."

Abeson and Zettel (1977) likewise note the relationship between PL 94-142 and Section 504:

> "To be in violation of PL 94-142, in most situations, also will mean a violation of Section 504, which in its finality can mean the withholding of all federal funds. This is particularly true in relation to the basic educational rights of children who have handicaps. Section 504 in concert with PL 94-142 will be the substance of implementation.

Since school officials are affected by the requirement of PL 94-142, state education agencies are also developing legislation to follow the provisions of the federal legislation. McCarthy and Marks (1977) discuss the role of the state and local education agency in regard to PL 94-142:

> "This statute which guarantees certain basic rights and protections to all handicapped children is, in effect, a civil rights act. Therefore, school officials do not have the luxury of ignoring its mandates; state and local education agencies will be affected by the requirements of this law regardless of their intent to apply for federal assistance. Consequently, although a local education agency may elect to forego federal funds under this Act, that local agency must follow the provisions of the statute with respect to each handicapped child who resides in the community served by the agency."

Illinois has had a comprehensive special education statute since 1969. A review of the revisions of that statute indicated that the first provision for due process rights became effective on July 1, 1973. That statute stated:

> "The right to a review of the educational placement of an individual child shall be available to the parents or guardians of all children who have exceptional needs including children for whom the school has recommended special education placement, children who have been declared ineligible for special education services, children whose needs have been identified out-

side the educational system and children whose parents believe they require special education services."

The Illinois statute underwent many revisions. Effective October 1, 1974 the section regarding the review of the educational placement was substantially increased to comply with PL 93-380. Further revisions that became effective August 23, 1976, September 1, 1978, December, 1978, and February 1, 1979 have reflected the mandated provisions of PL 94-142.

Many states have experienced difficulties in implementing the due process provisions of PL 94-142 even though many of the provisions were part of PL 93-380. In a study prepared by the Bureau of Education for the Handicapped in the U.S. Office of Education (1978) it was noted that although most of the twenty-six states studied had developed acceptable policies regarding due process procedures, many of these states had not been able to implement the policies. The Bureau noted that one of the difficulties in implementing the provisions was related to the states' difficulty in acquiring the resources needed for effective monitoring. Another problem area in implementing the due process provision was related to the difficulty that many of the states encountered in selecting hearing officers who were not affiliated with the agencies serving the children. However, according to the Bureau, ". . . several of these states have found ways to improve their due process procedures since the time of the program review."

Due process legislation, according to Abeson, Bolick and Haas, (1977) will not reduce the educators' professional responsibility, or authority but rather ". . . provide them with the leverage to do that which must be their goal -- to act openly and in the best interests of the children they serve." Due process can assure that the school personnel will do or have the opportunity to do what is required in the education of handicapped children.

Due Process Requirements of Public Law 94-142

Emerging after a long series of hearings, PL 94-142, The Education for All

Handicapped Children Act of 1975, was passed by votes of 404 to 7 in the House and 87 to 7 in the Senate. The law is a culmination of court decisions and federal and state laws which have required that definite procedures be followed in delivering special education services.

In concert with the due process model prescribed in the Amended Stipulation of PARC, each of the fundamental principles has been incorporated into the procedural safeguard requirements of PL 94-142. More specifically, as stated in the regulations, "Each state educational agency shall ensure that each public agency establishes and implements procedural safeguards." This responsibility represents the federal government's recognition that the states shall respond to judicial and legislative requirements in the area of due process in special education.

Until PL 94-142 was enacted, the circumstances under which due process could be invoked were limited to identification, evaluation, and placement. Under this Act, however, the Congress has extended the due process opportunity by providing ". . . an opportunity to present complaints with respect to any matter relating to the identification, evaluation, or educational placement of the child, or the provision of a free appropriate public education to such child."

The inclusion of due process procedures in PL 94-142 was stated by Abeson and Zettel (1978):

> "It is included in the Act to insure that all of the rights created by the Act are in fact made available to children who have handicaps, their families, and the public schools. One way of expressing this intent is to suggest that the presence of due process is designed to allow for equal consideration of the interests of all who are involved in the education of a handicapped child--the child, the family, the schools."

The specific principles of due process that are included in PL 94-142 are as follows:

Records: The parents have a right to inspect and review records; to make copies of records; to receive a list of all types and locations of records being collected, maintained or used by the agency; to ask for an explanation of any item in the records; to ask for an amendment of any record on the grounds it is inaccurate, misleading

or violates privacy rights; and to a hearing on the issue if the agency refuses to make the amendment.

Independent evaluation: The parents have a right to an independent educational evaluation of their handicapped child; to have the evaluation considered in any decision made in providing services to the child; to be told where an independent evaluation may be obtained at no expense or low expense; to have the agency pay for the evaluation if the agency's evaluation was not appropriate; to be told that an impartial hearing officer may be asked to order an independent evaluation at public expense, and to be told the criteria for the evaluation the examiner needed to secure payment by the agency.

Prior notice: Prior written notice must be given to the parents of a handicapped child before the agency initiates or changes, or refuses to initiate or change, the identification, evaluation or placement of the child or the provision of a free appropriate education. The notice must be in writing, in the parents' native language or other principal mode of communication, and at a level understandable to the general public. The notice must describe the proposed action, explain why it is proposed, describe the options considered and explain why those other options were rejected. Furthermore, the right to be notified of each evaluation procedure, test, record or report the agency will use as a basis for any proposed action must all be made in writing to the parents of a handicapped child.

Consent: Parental consent must be obtained before a preplacement evaluation is conducted and before initial placement in a program providing special education and related services. In the absence of parental consent, the agency has the right to proceed to a hearing to determine if the child should be initially evaluated or initially placed. At a hearing, the parent has the right to protest such an action in the absence of consent. After the initial placement of a child, parental consent is not required. Prior notification, however, is required before the agency initiates or changes, or refuses to initiate or change, the identification, evaluation or

placement of the child or the provision of a free appropriate education.

Hearing: The parents or a public educational agency may initiate a hearing relating to the identification, evaluation, placement or provision of a free appropriate public education for a handicapped child. The parents have a right to have the hearing conducted by the agency directly responsible for the child's education and to be told of any free or low-cost legal and other relevant services available.

The participants in a hearing must be gauranteed the following:

a. Right to a full notice of procedures and rights.

b. Right to have the hearing chaired by an impartial due process hearing officer (someone not an employee of the state or local agency providing services to the child).

c. Right to a timely proceeding, with a decision in writing within forty-five days of the request for a hearing, and within thirty days of an appeal.

d. Right to appear and be accompanied by counsel, and by persons with special knowledge.

e. Right to present evidence and to prohibit introduction of evidence not disclosed to them five days before the hearing.

f. Right to compel attendance of witnesses and to cross-examine them.

g. Right to receive a verbatim copy of the proceedings.

h. Right to a written decision with findings of fact relied upon.

i. Right to appeal to the state education agency, and from the state education agency to state or federal court.

j. Right to have the child remain in his present educational placement until the proceedings are completed.

Surrogate parent: Where no one can be found acting in the place of a parent, or where the known parent cannot be found, or where the child is a ward of the State, a surrogate must be appointed. The school must determine if a child is eligible for a surrogate. The school must have selection criteria for choosing a surrogate

that insure adequate representation of the child.

Evaluation procedures: The public educational agency shall establish procedures providing the right to have a full and individual evalaution of the child's educational needs; to assure that testing does not discriminate on the basis of language or culture; to have tests sensitive to impaired sensory, manual or speaking skills; to have more than one criterion used in determining the appropriate educational program; to have the evaluation performed by a multidisciplinary team; to have the child assessed in all areas related to the suspected disaiblity; and to have a re-evaluation every three years, or more frequently, if conditions warrant or if the child's parent or teacher requests it.

Least restrictive environment: The public educational agency shall establish and implement procedures that insure that handicapped children are educated with non-handicapped children to the maximum extent appropriate; that handicapped children are removed from the regular educational environment only after supplementary aids and services are tried and found to be unsatisfactory; that a continuum of alternative placements is available so that removal from the regular educational environment canbe of the least necessary duration; that supplementary services such as resources rooms or itinerant instruction are available to make it possible to remain in a regular class placement; to have the placement in the school the child would attend if non-handicapped, unless the individual education plan requires some other arrangement; and the right of the child to participate with the non-handicapped in non-academic and extracurricular services and activities such as meals, recess, counseling, athletics, transportation, health services, recreational activities, special interest groups or clubs, and employment opportunities.

Confidentiality of information: The parents must be given the right to restrict access to their child's records by withholding consent to disclose records; to be informed before information in the child's file is to be destroyed; and to be told to whom information has been disclosed.

The due process safeguards of PL 94-142 represent a series of steps which assure

the right of the parent and child to be fully informed and included in decision-making at all steps involving identification, child evaluation, planning, programming, and program evalaution. It becomes a safeguard for school personnel as well as the child and the parent or guardians. In a manual published by the National Association of State Directors of Special Education, a statement was made that ". . . everyone profits from well-planned practices and the elements of due process (Walker, 1976)."

Case law and federal and state legislation are clearly indicating that procedural due process -- the right to protest -- has become a necessary phase of the handicapped child's education.

Educational Implications of Due Process Provisions

The implications of due process for schools are massive. Practically everything a school might do concerning a handicapped child's education can be challenged in a due process hearing. Legislation and litigation simply carry forward the notion of fairness and extend it to handicapped children, emphasizing their essential equality, at law, with their nonhandicapped peers.

Due process hearings can also highlight the contrast between the ideal reality, showing a gap that may exist between the rights that are legally granted and the rights that are in fact available to handicapped children. The hearing can become a forum for deteriming whether the child is receiving an appropriate education, for focusing on the child's needs, and for providing school officials with information on whether they are accomplishing what they are required to accomplish.

In brief, due process is a technique for accountability, a means of assuring that the eudcational system will do or become able to do what it is designed and required to do.

Abeson and Zettel (1977) contend that due process can improve communications:

> "Many school systems operating under well established and understood due process systems have found that it can provide an effective means of guiding communications with the families of children with handicaps. It sets out a series of procedures for communication that allow all inter-

> ested parties to be informed as to the educational status of a handicapped child. In the vast majority of situations, the communication is what has been missing and is what is sought. When, however, there is disagreement as to the status or what is in the appropriate interest of the child, the more extensive procedures can be used. School personnel as well as parents can use these procedures to insure that what is required -- the appropriate education of the child -- is achieved."

PL 94-142 is aimed at the school's responsibilities to guarantee a free and appropriate public education to all handicapped children. The due process safeguards deal with what the consumers can do if the school does not comply with the requirements of the Act. The due process safeguards can also be exercised by the school if the consumers object to the action that the school has proposed or withhold their consent to the evaluation of their children.

Despite the due process safeguards and the intent for parent involvement, a myriad of legal issues have arisen out of the Education for All Handicapped Children Act of 1975 (PL 94-142) and Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973. The following suits, involving due process safeguards, are worth noting.

In the case of Donnie R. v. Wood et al. (1977), the plaintiff was expelled for starting a fight without a written notice or a hearing. A hearing was held three weeks later where it was decided to permanently expel the plaintiff despite expert testimony that it was not necessary. The plaintiff received no educational services for four months when three hours a week of homebound instruction was arranged. The parties agreed to an immediate educational evaluation and provision of appropriate educational services after the plaintiff alleged that his rights were violated under Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973.

In Mattie R. v. Holladay (1977), the first case to be decided under PL 94-142, the plaintiffs moved for summary judgment against officials of the Mississippi Department of Education charging that the defendants had failed to adopt sufficient policies and procedures to ensure the plaintiffs' procedural safeguards such as notice and hearing, programs to locate and identify children in need of special education, racially and culturally nondiscriminatory testing, and educational programs in the least restrictive environment. The plaintiffs also moved for summary judgment

against the state defendants and ordered the defendants to develop a state plan in compliance with PL 94-142. The court also granted the motions for summary judgment against the local education agency defendants and held that the individual child has a substantive right to appropriate educational services under Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973.

The plaintiff in the case of Stuart v. Nappi (1978) was a pupil with serious academic and emotional difficulties who was involved in a disruptive incident at school. The plaintiff sought a preliminary injunction of an expulsion hearing to be held by the local board of education. The court enjoined the board of education from conducting a hearing to expel Kathy Stuart. In that decision the court held that the child's placement can only be changed through a review of the child's special education program and a determination of whether a child's present placement is appropriate. The court noted that expulsion contradicts PL 94-142's mandate that all placement decisions must be made in conformity with a child's right to an education in the least restrictive environment. The court also held that PL 94-142 authorizes the federal courts to hear ". . . all claims of noncompliance with the Act's procedural safeguards, regardless of the amount in controversy."

A due process procedure was the predominant issue in Howard S. v. Friendswood Independent School District (1978). The plaintiff, a learning disabled and emotionally handicapped pupil, alleged that as a direct result of his inappropriate educational placement, he had prolonged and excessive absences from the classroom which led to his expulsion. The plaintiff, who was given no notice nor a hearing when he was expelled, sought an impartial due process hearing under PL 94-142 and also that the defendant school district develop such procedures along with comprehensive evaluation procedures. The plaintiff additionally alleged that his rights under Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 had also been violated. The court ordered a preliminary injunction, an immediate and comprehensive evaluation of the plaintiff to determine his needs, and IEP, and appropriate educational services.

The court upheld the plaintiff's charge in Lora v. New York Board of Education (1978) that special education placement without an adequate prior notice or an opportunity to be heard denied her an appropriate education and violated her rights under Pl 94-142, the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, the New York Education Law and the equal protection clause of the U.S. Constitution.

Kirp, Buss, and Kuriloff (1979) have pointed out some ways that educational systems in the past have evaded the spirit, if not the letter, of the law in implementing due process provisions. In California, where due process provisions similar to those outlined in PL 94-142 already existed, the due process practices of five California districts were studied. They found that parental permission was often secured without parental knowledge of the intent of their permission. In some cases permission for placement was obtained during the same visit as permission for testing. In three of the five districts studied, it was found that decisions regarding placement were made informally and that the formal hearing merely ratified informally reached decisions. Furthermore, the study revealed that although parents had the right to attend the placement meeting, this right was rarely exercised. In these districts, an average of only two-and-one half minutes was taken to present and to ratify each case. In the two other district studies, the admissions committee attempted a more thorough and systematic review.

The California experience clearly points to the fact that legal mandates cannot implement themselves. Educators must establish the measures necessary to ensure that the spirit as well as the letter of the law is translated into educational practice.

References

Abeson, Alan, Bolich, Nancy and Haas, Jayne, "Due Process of Law: Background and Intent," Public Policy and the Education of Exceptional Children, 1978

Donnie R. v. Wood et al., No. 77-1360 (D.S.C., 1977).

Hairston v. Drosick, 423 F. Supp. 180 (1976).

Howard S. et al. v. Friendswood Independent School District et al., CA-G-78-92 (S.D. Texas 1978).

Illinois Office of Education, Rules and Regulations to Govern the Administration and Operation of Special Education (Springfield, Illinois: State Board of Education, July 1, 1973), Article XI, Sec. 11.01.

Kirp, David, Buss, William and Duriloff, Peter, "Legal Reform of Special Education: Empirical Studies and Procedural Proposals," California Law Review, Vol. 62, No. 1 (January, 1974), 40-155.

LaVor, Martin, Federal Legislation for Exceptional Persons: A History, Public Policy and the Education of Exceptional Children, ed. Fredrick J. Weintraub, Alan Abeson, Joseph Ballard and Martin L. LaVor (Reston, Virginia: The Council for Exceptional Children, 1977).

Lora v. New York Board of Education, 46 U.S.L.W. 2683 (1978).

Mattie T. v. Holladay, D.C., No. 75-31-5 (N.D. Mississippi, 1977).

McCarthy, Martha M., and Marks, Linda B., "The New Law: A Challenge for State and Local Administrators," Viewpoints, Vol. 53, No. 2 (March 1977), 57.

Public Law 93-380, Education Amendments of 1974, 88 Stat. 484 (codified as 20 U.S.C. 1402-1461), Sec. 612, d, 13, A.

Public Law 94-142, Education for All Handicapped Children Act of 1975, 89 Stat. 773 (codified as 20 U.S.C. 1232-1453), Sec. 615, b, 1, E.

Stuart v. Nappi, 433 F. Supp. 1235 (1978).

Walker, Jeanette, (ed.), Functions of the Placement Committee in Special Education (Washington, D.C.: National Association of State Directors of Special Education, 1976).

U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, "Nondiscrimination on Basis of Handicap," Federal Register (Washington, D.C.: Office of the Secretary, May 4 1977), Sec. 84.4, p. 22678.

U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, Progress Toward a Free Appropriate Public Education (Washington, D.C.: Office of Education, August, 1978), pp. 27-29).

U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, "Education of Handicapped Children," Federal Register (Washington, D.C.: Office of Education, August 23, 1977), Subpart E, Sec. 121a.501.

PL 94-142: IMPLICATIONS FOR INSERVICE EDUCATION

William R. Hazard
Northwestern University

On November 29, 1975, Congress enacted PL 94-142, amending the Education of the Handicapped Act of 1971. The purposes of PL 94-142 are: (1) to insure and protect the educational rights of handicapped children and their parents, (2) to assist states and local school districts to provide for the education of all handicapped children, and (3) to assess and insure the effectiveness of such education. PL 94-142 does not require state or local school districts to provide education for handicapped children. It does, however, provide financial incentives to states and local districts to provide such education. The states typically mandate special education through statutes and state regulatory agencies. Illinois, for example, has provided for special education through legislation dating back to 1909 and, stimulated by the incentives provided in 94-142, has filed a comprehensive state plan with the United States Office of Education to implement the recent Education for All Handicapped Act. To implement the funding provisions of Part B of the Education of the Handicapped Act, the U.S.O.E. adapted Rules and Regulations that were published in the Federal Register on August 23, 1977. An examination of the major provisions of these rules will provide a basis on which to articulate the principal consequences for teachers and administrators and to explore the implications of this federal legislation for inservice education.

Reduced to its essence, the federal law seeks to provide a free, appropriate public education to all handicapped children through state educational machinery. This new federal commitment, conceived in equity and dedicated to remarkable broad goals raises intriguing and challenging questions. Who are the "handicapped children?" What does a free, appropriate public education look like? In what settings and under whose direction is such education delivered? Can the private interests of children and their parents mesh properly with the public resources,

professional skills, and policy imperatives available in the real world of schools and schooling? What steps are needed to implement the explicit and implicit strategies and structures in the legislation? To the extent that non-specialist teachers and administrators must undertake specialized behaviors, can these folks be adequately retrained to achieve the desired ends?

As a prelude to the adoption of PL 94-142, the Congress found inter alia that:

1. There are more than 8 million handicapped children in the U.S. today (1975).
2. The special education needs of such children are not being fully met.
3. More than one-half of the handicapped children in the U.S. do not receive appropriate educational services which would enable them to have full equality of opportunity.
4. One million of the children in the U.S. are excluded entirely from the public school system and will not go through the education process with their peers.
5. Many handicapped children are deprived of a successful educational experience because their handicaps are undetected.
6. Because of a lack of appropriate services in the public school system, families are forced to seek services elsewhere, often at their own expense and at a great distance from home.
7. Developments in the training of teachers and in diagnostic and instructional procedures and methods have so advanced that, given adequate funding, state and local education agencies can provide appropriate special education and related services.

Thus, the Congress found that additional special education services are needed and, with appropriate financial incentives to each state these services can be provided. Each state is encouraged to prepare and file a state plan which, if approved by the U.S.O.E., is funded by federal dollars based on a state entitlement formula. The formula includes (a) number of handicapped children ages 3-21 receiving special education and related services, (b) the average per pupil expenditure in public elementary and secondary schools in the U.S. and (c) a variable percentage 1978 - 5%, 1979 - 10%, 1980 - 20%, 1981 - 30%, and 1982 and thereafter - 40%. For state

grant formula computation, the Commissioner may not count more than 12% of the number of children aged 5-17 in a state; children with specific learning disabilities cannot exceed 2% of the 5-17 age group and certain other exclusions.

Given the objects of the legislation and the Congressional intent, as inferred from the legislative findings, let us turn now to some of the basic provisions of the new law. Definition of terms:

"Free appropriate education" -- special education and related services provided at public expense, under public supervision and direction, without charge, and meets the State Education Agency standards and offered in conformity with an individualized education program.

"Handicapped children" -- those children evaluated as being:

mentally retarded
hard of hearing
deaf
speech impaired
visually handicapped
seriously emotionally disturbed
orthopedically impaired
other health impaired
deaf-blind
multi-handicapped
with a specific learning disability.

These children because of their impairments need special education and related services. Needless to say, the critical element in decisions concerning the "appropriate education" for these children is the clarity of understanding both of the handicap and the educational consequences. Example: read definitions of "seriously emotionally disturbed" and "specific learning disability." (sec. 121a.5 (8) and (9)). Accurate diagnosis leads to (a) accurate identification of the handicapping condition, (b) appropriate prescriptive or remediating educational experience, and (c) accurate re-diagnosis to ascertain when, or if, the handicapping condition is overcome and the child returns to "normal" schooling. "Individualized educational program:" a written statement for a handicapped child that is developed and implemented in accordance with a specified procedure involving meetings, notice

to and participation or opportunity for participation by parents. The IEP for each child must include:

a. present levels of child's educational performance
b. annual goals, including short term instructional objectives
c. specific special education and related services and the extent to which child is to participate in regular program
d. projected dates for initiation of special services and their duration
e. appropriate objective criteria, evaluation procedures and schedules for determining, at least annually, whether objectives are being achieved

Three other major components in the prescribed state plans should be noted.

1. Due process procedures for parents and children
2. Placement in the least restrictive environment
3. Confidentiality of information

The rules go to considerable length to protect the "due process" rights of parents and pupils. Liberty and property interests are protected against state deprivation by the 14th amendment; liberty interest--reputation; property interest--access to appropriate schooling. Both Pennsylvania Association for Retarded Children and Mills (1971) recognized and defined the property and liberty interests of children and parents entitled to special education. Due process protections provided in the regulations include appropriate notice to parents at key decision points in the identification, diagnosis, evaluation, and placement processes. The notice seeks to obtain the informed consent of the parents and includes safeguards for meaningful communication to the parent about such decisions. Parents and agents have rights of access to the school's records concerning these events and decisions and appropriate restrictions on access by others seeks to protect the confidentiality of parent and child. Independent evaluations of the child are provided under appropriate circumstances. The parent or the school agency may initiate an impartial due process hearing whenever the agency proposes to:

a. initiate or change the identification, evaluation, or educational placement of the child or the provision of a free appropriate public education to the child or

b. refuses to do any of the above

Hearings are conducted by the state or public agency responsible for the child's education.

Rights at hearing:

1. counsel
2. present evidence
3. confront, cross-examine, and compel attendance of witnesses
4. prohibit introduction of evidence not disclosed to the party at least 5 days prior to hearing
5. obtain a written or electronic verbatim record of hearing
6. obtain written findings of fact and decisions
7. parents must be given right to have child present
8. open hearing to public

Appeal:

Administration appeal by either party to State Education Agency
Civil action

Unless parties agree otherwise, administrative or judicial appeal "freezes" the child's education placement.

Perhaps the most relevant provision for "regular" teachers and administrators is that providing for the "least restrictive environment." The regulations provide that each public agency shall insure:

(1) that to the maximum extent appropriate, handicapped children are educated with non-handicapped children, and

(2) that special classes, separate schooling, or other kinds of academic segregation occur only when the nature or severity of the handicap renders mainstreaming unsatisfactory.

"Mainstreaming" as it is called, has the potential to be helpful or hurtful, depending in large measure on how we adults deal with the opportunity. The choice likely will be on whether regular teachers and administrators are willing and able to deliver appropriate schooling to these children and this brings us to the central point of this presentation--the implications of PL 94-142 for inservice education.

When we talk about innovation, change, and new professional skills and responsibilities, too often we ignore a central reality--the risk and consequences of failure are powerful inhibitors to change in professional behaviors. The law clearly intends that a broad range of children with special needs enroll in my regular classes. I know how to teach "regular" children. I am not sure I know how to teach "exceptional" or "handicapped" children. I am uneasy about the prospect.

Help! If I am not persuaded that I can do the job, my response probably will be avoidance behavior. I will talk of "academic standards," appropriateness or inappropriateness of my course or class for such children, or I will argue that my class or courses will not meet these kids' needs; send them elsewhere. Finally, the one unthinkable, but tragically human, response: O.K. I must accept these handicapped children in my school, my class, my educational activity, but they won't succeed.

The self-fulfilling prophecy -- born of fear, uncertainty, anxiety, or whatever, that handicapped children cannot learn in the mainstreamed setting -- is an eloquent and persuasive argument for inservice education. The rules require that each state plan must provide for the development and implementation of a comprehensive system of personnel development designed to provide inservice training of regular and special instructional, related services, and support personnel. Modest funding is provided through the State plan to support this in service effort. Some implications for inservice training seem clear:

1. Each state plan must identify inservice training needs and content areas. (e.g., I.E.P., non-discriminatory testing, least restrictive environment, procedural safeguards, etc.) and specify the groups requiring such training (e.g., special teachers, regular teachers, specialists, administrators, and others). Apparently, the duty to encourage, stimulate, support, and implement focused, targeted inservice rests clearly on the State.

2. The inservice needs must be assessed and woven into a plan designed to prepare a broad range of professionals for new instructional and support responsibilities under PL 94-142. Given the broad range of inservice needs among so diverse a group of professionals and the time frame for delivery of special education services, it would make sense to establish some priorities for inservice.

3. On the theory that a supportive, receptive learning climate in the classroom is of higher critical importance than some specific technical skill in the regular teacher, it would suggest that positive teacher attitudes toward handicapped children might be a priority over the technical, specialized pedagogical methods for this or that handicap.

   If the handicapped child is "mainstreamed" into a nonreceptive or hostile classroom setting, little positive gains in academic and affective learning are likely. This suggests to me that, given the realistic impossibility of dealing with all inservice issues at once, it makes sense to warm up the administrative and teaching climate first.

4. Teachers and administrators will need to understand the nature and pedagogical consequences of the range of handicapping conditions. Fear of the unknown is logical. Anxiety runs high in the face of pressure to perform unarticulated acts. If teachers do not know what teaching and learning behaviors to expect with handicapped pupils, they will exhibit some non-productive attitudes and behaviors.

   Systematic information about children, their handicapping condition, their capacities, limitations, and the vast available pedagogical knowledge, delivered in a setting conducive to learning and application will be highly useful to teachers and administrators.

5. We must insure that regular teachers and administrators have access to realistic, accurate, and specific instructional and evaluative tools and strategies for the handicapped children in their schools and classrooms. By whatever means this knowledge is made available, it should reflect the best and most powerful pedagogy available and delivered in a supportive, minimally threatening manner. The object is to enhance the educational opportunity for handicapped children and not to spotlight teacher anxiety, academic shortcomings, or any such schoolhouse culture dysfunctions.

6. In sensitizing regular teachers to the learning modes and educational needs of handicapped children, we should remember that these teachers are professionals who have earned their spurs as teachers. Whatever inservice training mode we adopt should respect the teacher's professional role and respond to their ego needs as well as their knowledge needs.

   Much of the inservice training likely will be given by specialists--psychometricians, audiologists, social workers, and various highly trained technicians. Too often, I'm afraid we tend to inflate their importance and the weight of their insights at the expense of the classroom teacher. The familiar pecking order in school or pupil decisions seems to be administator, specialist, teacher; quite the reverse of the working knowledge about a specific child. I urge that we, overtly or covertly, not treat the regular teacher as the "dummy" in this academic bridge game. If, in translating the inservice program for regular teachers, we treat these teachers as ignorant workers to be enlightened by the "Queen Bee" specialists, we will fail and the handicapped children assigned to their classes will suffer. Rather, I hope we recognize and build upon the teaching skills and knowledge of regular teachers, expand their knowledge about handicapped children in positive, supportive, and parsimonious ways, and reinforce their sense of professional worth and capacities to deal effectively with new challenges represented by "mainstreaming."

7. The in-service agenda precipitated by PL 94-142 will be heavy and will deal with important knowledge and skills at both the conceptual and practice levels.

   For example:

   a. The functional, operational definition of a "free, appropriate public education" is not clear. The question of appropriateness opens up remarkably complex issues of philosophy, politics, psychology and law to name just a few.

b. Diagnostic skills for some handicapping conditions, notably those of the mind, are at primitive levels. We can do much damage to children through grossly erroneous diagnoses and the best intended remediation if we overstate our skills and underestimate our errors.

c. The culture of remediation as a labelled, dead end, separate educational world must be dismantled. To identify children as handicapped is both a blessing and a curse. To the extent such identification gives them access to effective, carefully-designed instructional and support services, it can bless them; to the extent, however, that it leads to labelling, self-fulfilling prophecies and systematic alienation from the "regular" school culture, it is a curse.

Finally and perhaps obviously, the magnitude of the inservice tasks facing the 2,000,000+ regular teachers and administrators as a result of PL 94-142 is staggering. If we succeed, truly the children will gain immensely; if we fail, we may be on the verge of badly disserving a generation of children already burdened with more than their share of heartache.

SOME THOUGHTS CONCERNING THE CURRENT STATE OF PL 94-142 AND OUR SECONDARY SCHOOLS

Crag Orear
Roosevelt University

Having just completed an academic year as a Faculty Fellow in Roosevelt University's Dean's Grant project, I have been asked to submit my impressions of the implications of PL 94-142 on secondary education and teacher education. For the eighteen years I have served the University, I have been an observer of the local secondary schools and involved in preparing teachers for them.

It does not take long to notice that public secondary schools respond to powerful, though opposed, value systems imbedded in our society. On the one hand, they are asked, even compelled, to serve eveyone equally: the Education for All Handicapped Children Act merely restates Horace Mann's forceful words from his 10th Report (1846):

> I believe in the existence of a great, immutable principle of natural law, or natural ethics ... which proves the absolute right of every human being that comes into the world to an education; and which, of course, proves the correlative duty of every government to see that the means of education are provided for all.

On the other hand, the secondary schools are viewed as a sorting and selecting agency where merit is measured through competitive pressures, where survivors are permitted to continue in society's mainstream and failures are relegated to a perpetual underclass. During the past year's observations of many of this area's high schools, I failed to discern much effect of either Mann or PL 94-142 on high school practices.

Both formal and informal questioning of high school administrators and faculty by my students and myself found little evidence of compliance with PL 94-142. Perhaps the poorest example of "mainstreaming" offered was reference to a star football player who had broken a leg but was permitted to attend classes on crutches. No IEP needed there! Generally, students are still labeled into traditional categories of EMH, LD, hearing impaired, etc. and separated for most

of the class day. Indeed, many schools label regular students into categories based on achievement/ability and streamed into separate classes. Exceptions were found in physical education classes, art, music, and sometimes business education and home economics classes. The Chicago public schools generally were the most reactionary, but it should be remembered that Chicago's urban school system must respond to national and local forces which increase the range and depth of problems while they experience decreasing resources available to meet them. It is not surprising that a recent analysis suggests that Chicago's dropout rate exceeds 50%. Studies repeatedly show that students who have poor attendance records and who leave school before graduation disproportionately include handicapped students. Many of these were recognized in elementary special education programs but were quickly lost in the complexity of urban high schools.

As higher socioeconomic families send their children to private and suburban schools, Chicago's urban school population has become overwhelmingly impoverished, representing the traditional underclass as well as recent immigrant groups. This population also suffers from various handicapping conditions due to nutritional, cultural, and psychological disadvantages associated with poverty and various forms of social alienation.

Miller, Sabatino and Larsen (1978) point out that the majority of University special education programs focus on elementary remediation rather than on high school youth. They suggest that rather than simply stressing remediation of basic literacy and social skills, "the majority of teaching activities directed to adolescent handicapped pupils should be spent on skills for coping with daily living, occupational preparation, and psychological problems ... The continuation of elementary educational practices in secondary schools is in part due to the fact that many professionals working in secondary special education were trained in instructional and behavioral management college courses directed toward the

elementary level."

If we are to achieve the ethic embodied in PL 94-142 at the secondary school level, we must transform the focus from standard curriculum mastery to a student-oriented approach that recognizes, and celebrates, the variety of differences among all individuals. Such individualization would resist the current fad of minimal competency sweeping many states, including Illinois, in which attention is limited to the rate at which each student masters elements of a standard curriculum ("mastery learning/continuous progress" in Chicago). Rather, such an approach as stated by Zigmund (1978) would provide

> "highly flexible (mainstreamed programs) with ample opportunities for student participation, if mainstreamed secondary schools offered a broad curriculum, including extra-instructional programs and community experience, if considerable attention were paid to helping students develop and appraise values and apply them in life situations, if opportunities were given for meaningful creative experiences in the arts, literature, handicrafts, sports, home arts, languages as well as in the more academic disciplines, and if orientation to careers were considered an appropriate function of the mainstream secondary school."

Such a shift in orientation for secondary schools would return to the humanistic values implied by Horace Mann and PL 94-142.

As stated by Carol Sivage in her article "The State of the Art in Secondary Mainstreaming" in Acheson et al, Implications of Mainstreaming for Secondary Teacher Education, 1978: "Philosophically, mainstreaming means the valuing of human differences. It implies that heterogeneous grouping is more growth promoting, both academically and in human qualities than is homogeneous grouping. It refers to the inclusion rather than the exclusion of people. Humanism in education emphasizes the dignity of the individual to self-fulfillment, and the role of the school in helping the individual to develop skills and interest to the maximum. A major function of the school is to treat each person as an individual, as opposed to unnecessary labeling or grouping. The school is seen as a mechanism for the self-actualization of all children."

Those educators who share a more humanistic approach to secondary education

fear that a mechanistic approach to PL 94-142 might so divert their energies (identification, staffing, IEP, evaluation, etc.) that they might sacrifice their "ordinary" students. This sentiment has been graphically expressed by a high school English teacher (Massie, 1978):

> "For one school year in one class, I had a boy who was deaf. His needs and demands were so overwhelming that he took 60 per cent of my teaching time, energy, and creativity, leaving 34 other students scavenging for crumbs.
>
> What no one urging mainstreaming seems to be aware of is that all kids are special. In that same class, I had a sweet, troubled boy who was not only dyslexic but on hard drugs. He needed love more than anything else, and loving takes time. In the same class, I had a remarkably gifted boy who needed special lesson plans, books, and so on. He was a joy to teach, but special plans take time. In the same class, I also had disadvantaged students, kids whose parents were alcoholic, kids who read on second grade level, kids who needed to find out about birth control, kids who needed one adult in their lives they could trust.
>
> It's not fair to focus so much attention on just one kind of special need and leave the majority the leftovers."

To recognize at all adequately the individuality of each learner, we must abandon the seductive syndrome of "blaming the victim" in our justification of the extreme competitiveness endemic in our high schools and learn to accept each student as worthy of an IEP whether mandated or not. All students deserve the planning and respect which can ensure success experiences. Why should such benefits be restricted to "handicapped" pupils? If only we could know each student sufficiently well, we might discover a mixture of handicapping and normal attributes. Indeed this theme of a fundamental benefit to education through implementation of PL 94-142 can be seen in the more perceptive literature (Herman, 1977):

> "(Mainstreaming will) ... enrich the lives of all our children and society. It can be the cutting edge of a more realistic educational experience of all children, handicapped and non-handicapped alike. If we look at the school setting as a place where humane and compassionate values are transferred to each child, if we prepare ourselves for the mainstreamed classroom, if we can deal with the broad spectrum of variations that make up the delivery of equal educational services to all handicapped children, then we shall enter a new era."

Perhaps, following (or returning to) the more humanistic approach to education,

> What is proposed are good teaching methods. They will be equally successful with any member of the class, handicapped or not. Secondary teachers must shift emphasis to individual learners needs rather than insistence on a rigid curriculum ... The curriculum must be thought of as a flexible resource, to be adapted and supplemented to fit individual needs. We must train our teachers to diagnose deficits and strengths in their students, to adapt the curriculum to meet the needs of the individual and to evaluate the progress of the individual learner, whether handicapped or not.

It will not hasten the implementation of this humanistic approach for universities, or their professors, to criticize the public schools without offering assistance. Our students must have direct experiences in those situations more closely approaching our ideals. Universities such as Roosevelt must seek practical situations where both their special education and regular teacher trainees can experience effective mainstreaming in secondary schools. Special education cannot be primarily limited to elementary children: the exceptionality of adolescents and youth has been poorly served (as has youth in general), but PL 94-142 may be the energizing catalyst we so sorely need.

A final quote critical of the K-12 approach of most special education programs is instructive (Miller, 1978):

> "In conclusion, it appears that Public Law 94-142 may serve as an impact measure primarily at the elementary school level unless specifically prepared special educators are available to implement appropriate secondary programs for mildly handicapped adolescents. The onus is therefore on universities to initiate new programs capable of providing an age sensitive structure, and it is the responsibility of the public schools to develop sufficient resource training programs that will provide cooperative student teaching placements."

References

Herman, Robert. Public Law: Implications for Mainstreaming, quoted in Ashley, J. "Mainstreaming: One Step Forward, Two Steps Back", American Educator, 1, Oct., 1977.

Massie, Dorothy. Update on Education of the Handicapped, Today's Education, 67, Sept./Oct., 1978.

Miller, S., Sebation, D., & Larsen, R. Issues in the Professional Preparation of Secondary School Special Educators, Exceptional Children, Vol. 46, 1978.

Zigmon, Naomi. A Prototype of Comprehensive Services for Secondary Students with Learning Disabilities, Learning Disabilities Quarterly, Vol. 1, 1978.

PL 94-142: CHANGING THE PHILOSOPHY OF EDUCATION FOR THE HANDICAPPED

Maynard C. Reynolds
University of Minnesota

In the history of education, the decade of the 1970's unquestionably will be remembered as the one in which two monumental principles were established. First, the right to education for all children, even for those with profound handicaps and marked cultural differences, was held to be a constitutional guarantee. Second, our society committed itself to the principle that it must provide education for all children with no exceptions. The schools have been mandated, under Public Law 94-142, literally to search out all handicapped children and youth between the ages of 3 and 21 and to provide them with the kind of education that is appropriate for their needs. This emphasis on education appropriate to the individual is also a notable innovation in our concepts of schooling, at least in the sense that now it must be taken seriously!

Among the new phrases given currency by Public Law 94-142 is the Individualized Educational Plan (IEP). This is the mechanism to insure that every handicapped child receives the individualized educational program which he or she needs. In the larger sense, the IEP requires schools to stop writing educational prescriptions simply on the basis of children's handicaps and to start devising programs according to the individual needs of each child. IEP's must be developed by teams of school personnel (e.g., regular classroom teacher, special education teacher, and school psychologist) and negotiated with the parents of each child or with the child itself. Nicholas Hobbs has noted that schools are discovering parents like explorers rediscovering Niagara Falls. Plans, processes, and programs for handicapped children must be brought out into the open now and clear lines of accountability must be established: to the individual children, to parents, and to communities. The future of schools, like the future of any enterprise will lie in satisfying the consumers of its products.

Another new term created by Public Law 94-142 is "least restrictive environment." It simply means that specialized programs for students with handicaps must be conducted in their natural environments--home or school--to the maximum extent feasible. If a child must be moved to a special class or removed from his home for placement in a residential school, the change must be based on a justifiable prescription for a specific period of time. It is on the implementation of programs according to this principle of the least restrictive environment that much of the popular discussion of mainstreaming or integration has taken place. Essentially, the standards which must be followed are the same as those which are operative in mental health. You try to create supports for the person with special needs in his or her natural environment--home and community--and you displace the person to a special setting only when these community-based efforts fail.

Special educators, and I include myself among them, in the past, have been too "place" oriented, too oriented to the geography of special services. We thought that special education could go on only in special classrooms and special schools. But we have learned with experience that, for example, Braille can be taught almost anywhere and blind children do not need to be isolated in state institutions for the blind. For that matter, we do not even need special classes for the blind in our neighborhood schools. It has been amply demonstrated that if we detach some of the specialists from their special places and send them out to where the youngsters are, we can provide the children with the special or intensive instruction which they need right in their natural environments. And that is what we are charged to do under Public Law 94-142. The principle of placing children according to least restrictive alternatives was not created by the Congressional mandate; it has been crystallizing in many places over the past 15 years or so and was made a part of Public Law 94-142 because it works for both students and teachers.

These two principles--IEP and least restrictive environment--have tremendous implications for regular classroom teachers and other school personnel. One of the changes which can be summarized quickly is the shift in the classroom from referral

to consultation. Instead of referring out children who are hard to teach, regular classroom teachers bring in consultants. Teachers are learning how to use second adults in their classrooms. The school psychologist and special education resource personnel come in to help teachers understand the educational and social problems of children and, perhaps, to install intensive forms of instruction or behavior control right there in the classroom. The psychologists and educational resource personnel are being asked to detach themselves from the special places where they were accustomed to operate and to come into the mainstream where the children are.

Seymour Sarason said that "specialists tend to create environments that only specialists can manage." We have spent far too much of our resources in the past teaching children to get along in specialized places and then labeling them "unsatisfactory" when they were brought back to regular schools where they had not learned how to function. The effect of the mainstreaming movement is to bring both the specialists and the persons needing their services into the community or the neighborhood schools where the persons can learn to get along in the mainstream and to participate in the opportunities provided there.

The parents of children who are not handicapped are keeping a very critical watch on the schools. Some of them, like some educators, are beginning to see the changes which are occurring in the schools as openers for future changes in the education of all children. Many of my colleagues across the country are predicting that soon we will be writing IEP's for all children, not just for those with handicaps. We probably will have to simplify the procedures somewhat and change the IEP's form, but we will not be able to go on very long providing a service for one group of children without providing it for all. Nor can we justify accountability which does not extend to the entire body of children in schools and their parents. One can see little lights going on all over the country as people become aware that the changes occurring in the schools today are the prelude to changes which will affect all of education for all children and youth.

The school systems of the large cities in the nation--Chicago, New York,

Philadelphia, and Los Angeles, for example--are having a harder time carrying out the intent of the provision of Public Law 94-142 than the systems of smaller cities. In the large cities the bureaucracies are terribly large, terribly centralized, and terribly specialized. In New York, for example, the centralized bureaucracy includes 350 school psychologists who are in the process of decentralization so they can begin to work at the building level with regular classroom teachers. Changing the bureaucratic structure also means changing professional roles and even personal lives. But society no longer will tolerate the remoteness that permits a youngster to be referred to a center in a strange part of town which is staffed by people who know nothing of the child's neighborhood or out-of-school life situation and where he or she goes through an assembly line of tests and comes out with a batch of papers containing scores and evaluations which may change the child's life but for which no one can be held accountable. Studies of youngsters for the planning and conduct of programs will have to occur very close to the place where the programs are carried out and the teachers and specialists will have to be there, and they will have to be accountable. If children are not served according to the provisions of Public Law 94-142 in Detroit, Chicago, New York, and other large cities, it will be very easy to say, "See! The law won't work." But all of us all over the country have a moral, ethical, and professional obligation to develop the framework that will help to further the individual growth of all children within the context of their constitutional and human rights.

Before proceeding further, let us seek some common understandings of what we mean by children with handicaps. For many persons, "Handicapped Child" is the beautiful, 4-5-year-old blue-eyed blonde with leg braces who looks out at us from posters during funding drives. Unfortunately, not many handicapped children look like that and very few wear leg braces. The Congressional discussions leading to Public Law 94-142 estimated that about 10-12% of all children are handicapped. No more than about 3-4% of all children have distinct, chronic, visible handicaps such as blindness, deafness, severe retardation, and major orthopedic problems. The

largest proportion of handicapped children suffer from what might be called more functional and less chronic problems, the kind that often are described in terms of "learning disability," "emotional disturbance," "mild" or "educable mental retardation." Over the span of years from kindergarten through sixth grade, these terms may be used at one time or another to describe about 40% of all school children; and during the course of any one year, about 20% of all children may be so described; but at any one moment only about 10-12% are considered to be handicapped. It is apparent, consequently, that some functional handicaps can be corrected if they are treated promptly and intensively.

The identification of functional handicaps, however, has become a sore issue. I am referring especially to the difficulties that have arisen in relation to the traditional testing, classification, and placement procedures which have been used as the prelude to providing special education services. Particularly suspect are the procedures which have been used commonly to classify children as mentally retarded, learning disabled, or emotionally disturbed.

The recent reaffirmation of a decision in the California courts, Larry P. vs. Riles (1979) disallows the use of individual intelligence tests for the classification and placement of minority-group pupils as "educable mentally retarded." The number of children in EMR classes in California dropped from the high of about 56,000 a half dozen years ago to only 19,000 two years ago, and the trend probably is still downward. This court decision may not be legally binding in all states of the union but it is highly indicative of what may be considered desirable practices. When principles or procedure are established judicially, the next step in litigation is personal liability suits based on intentional discrimination. The result, obviously, is very conservative classification behavior by special educators and school psychologists. Clearly, EMR as one of the big educational placement categories is in trouble in the United States. The implications for regular classroom teachers are very important. Children who formerly might have been displaced to classes for EMR pupils now are retained in the mainstream classrooms and schools; teachers,

consequently, are being required to manage a greater range of learning behaviors among the children they teach.

Learning Disabilities. "Learning disabilities" is another of the large growing categories in special education in the United States. The definition of learning disabilities as a category always has been an embarrassment. Usually, the definitions start with a statement about the individual's educability, which tends to be based heavily on an individually administered intelligence test--a difficulty this classification shares with the EMR classification--and on general aptitude tests. In Hobbs (1975) learning disabilities is characterized as a term that is "used to imply handicapping conditions associated with the inability of a child to perform school tasks at a level expected of him" (p. 79). Definitions that include the specification of a pupil's achievement level and the calculation of discrepancies from estimated "capacity," "expectations," or "level of educability" create more problems than solutions. Some years ago, Robert Thorndike commented to the effect that when you've got high expectations and low achievement, it's really very hard to know whether the psychologist over-predicted or the child underachieved.

More than a technical difficulty is involved in the various definitions of learning disabilities. LD classes tend to include a disproportionate number of majority children who are not achieving while minority children go elsewhere. Another and perhaps greater embarrassment is created when the discrepancies between expectations and performance are not noticed until the particular children are in the third, fourth, or fifth grade and then the special educators are called in to work on the children.

Recently, I looked over the little publication from the Far West Regional Education Laboratory called Educational Programs that Work by McIntyre (1979). The largest number of programs therein which have been juried by the National Institute of Education and the U.S. Office of Education through the Joint Dissemination Review Panel (JDRP) focus on early primary reading instruction. Indeed, our knowledge base for improving instruction in basic skills at primary school levels is sub-

stantial; thus, there are only poor excuses for waiting until the children fail badly before we institute treatment. We need to observe in detail all children, to find those who are not responding to instruction, and then to do some diagnostic work-ups that will enable us to carry out intensive forms of instruction. The children in this big and growing Learning Disabilities category belong in mainstream classrooms. The fact that they are there will mean that different behaviors will be required of regular classroom teachers and a different deployment of specialists will be needed so that they are available to work in direct collaboration with the teachers.

Emotionally Disturbed. A lot of different criteria are used to distinguish the children who are clinically or situationally disordered, that is, who are emotionally disturbed or socially maladjusted. When classrooms are disorderly, more children tend to be labeled as disturbed. The difficulty of diagnosing such children is exemplified in the case of Lora, a child in the City of New York, who was classified as emotionally disturbed. A court decided in her case that indeed she had been improperly diagnosed as emotionally disturbed and mandated a training strategy to make sure the problem did not recur. The New York City Schools were directed to retrain every teacher in the school system, which means more than 70,000 persons. How do you train or retrain such a large number of people in a short time? In New York, 12 full-time teachers were given the necessary instruction and they trained 3,000 part-time teachers; then all of them went out into the 1,000 school buildings to train all the other teachers. It is the largest inservice training program ever undertaken in the history of mankind, and it arose from the misclassification of one child.

The point of emphasis I want to make is that some of the largest categories of handicapped students are perhaps not so distinct as we have thought. The categories do not "carve nature at its joints." Diagnoses need to be made of classroom situations as well as of children. Our concerns must include more children than just the distinctly handicapped "poster" child. When we talk about handicapped children, we are referring to large numbers of consumers of education, most of whom have rela-

tively mild handicaps which need to be understood in broad ecological terms.

I serve on an advisory committee for special education programs in one city. The committee includes a good many parents and representatives of such categorical organizations as The Association for Children with Learning Disabilities and The National Association for Retarded Citizens, etc. At one meeting I asked the following question: "What if we made arrangements in every school building to observe all children carefully and to identify those who are not responding to instruction satisfactorily; then, what if we drew in the necessary resources to study the latter youngsters carefully and then we drew additional resources that would intensify the instructional programs and develop alternative programs for them? We would look at every youngster's total intellectual development, achievement, personality, and social development. We would not pull out one dimension and label a child, that is, we would not say that any child is mentally retarded or emotionally disturbed. Such labels are pretty simplistic. We would observe the youngsters who are not responding to instruction in the basic subjects, to what Stoddard called the 'cultural imperatives' (language development, mathematics, the rudiments of social behavior, and self-maintenance, self-care, etc.). And the youngsters who were not moving in these territories would have intensified programs but no labels."

I asked a delegate from the Association for Children with Learning Disabilities if it would be all right with her if the schools carried out such a program without labels. She answered immediately. "It would be just fine; that's what we would like." I am not sure that she spoke for all members of the Association, however.

I turned to several minority parents and said, "Now supposing that when we did that, it was discovered in some places that there were two or three times as many Hispanic or Black children as others who were so identified and given special instructional help? Would you object to that?"

The answer did not come quite so quickly. "It would be all right as long as it worked." I detected a kind of fatigue in the answer; so many panaceas have

been promised and so few, if any, have tended to work.

It seemed to me that there was no objection if we stay very close to the instructional situation and do not label youngsters or move them off to special places. If the responses were indicative, society is asking us to go to work on that base system, to enhance our power to deal with individual differences, to do less simplistic categorizing and labeling, and to displace fewer youngsters into special settings. We are being held accountable to perform professionally.

I like a term that was used by Professor Broude of the University of Illinois. He said that teachers are going to have to meet the test of consensus doctorum, the same as other professions. If you convene a group of learned people in any field to review the work of a co-professional, would they agree that the performance met high standards? A physician, for example, cannot always guarantee that a patient will live any more than a teacher can guarantee that a particular child will learn to read. However, if the patient dies or the child does not read, you can bring together learned people in the field and you can ask questions: Did this physician make reasonable judgments? Did this teacher perform competently? Increasingly, educators at all levels are facing this kind of accountability.

But there is a new aspect of accountability which may become quite a problem for us. Once principles and policies have been made fairly clear in the law and some have been enunciated by the courts, as in the cases of Larry P. and Lora, we who have behaved inconsistently in carrying out these principles may well find ourselves subject to personal liability suits. I may be anticipating, but I see us heading into an era in which instead of court actions that seek relief through administrative modifications of school programs, we may become involved in cases where the individual psychologist or teacher is held to be responsible for acts of commission or omission.

There is no question that the mandate to provide individualized educational programs for handicapped children in least restrictive environments has created new problems which have been thrust upon unprepared schools and teachers. We have a

desperate need for programs that are designed to develop the capacity of both school systems and school personnel to deliver on the intent and promises of Public Law 94-142. Adequate solutions to this need call for a thorough redevelopment of teacher preparation. We cannot neglect certain topics in our training programs when we are working with teachers who will be expected to perform competently within the context of the law. Here is where Deans' Grants Projects come in.

Teacher training programs are finding that they need a largely reconstructed foundation. A lot more is involved than a few easy lessons on handicapped children. We need a new approach to measurement, new units in philosophy and better orientation in sociology. How can we create social movements in which there are mutual helpfulness and awareness of and respect for differences? We will have to have help from many quarters.

A few fundamental changes in universities and colleges will be needed as well as changed in the professional aspects and practicums of teacher training. It may be that we have not negotiated within our universities or communities for enough academic space to do this job. It will be very tough political territory to find enough time and space. Saturday afternoons are not very popular times we know for opening up some of these subjects. We will have to find a regular time in which we can get on to these matters.

Also, we have the problem of mapping the territory of making clear the kind of journey we're on--in terms of curriculum. There are 117 Deans' Grants Projects across the country which are trying very hard to do some of this mapping. They are trying to pull together ideas on the directions which teacher education must take. For example, if teachers cannot make referrals of children who are hard to teach but are expected to call in specialists for consultation, then obviously the preservice training must prepare teachers to be effective users of consultation. It has never been done in teacher education before. In the same way, if teachers are expected to negotiate children's programs with parents, then teachers must be

given preparation in additional clinical skills to deal with families and parents, parent education, family education, and a variety of new topics. Work is moving forward rapidly in this kind of effort to spell out the curricular implications for teacher education.

At this time, we have an unusual opportunity to make progress. Special educators are ready to join up with regular classroom teachers to eliminate the discontinuities from the lives of both teachers and students and to create a unified school system that has more power to accommodate individual differences. The resources and personnel of special education will have to be brought into the mainstream. Instead of many narrow streams--Title I programs, bilingual programs, special education programs, for example--all the programs will have to be made a part of one broad mainstream. Special educators are ready to help make this change.

Many of the parent groups are seeing that they must show more concern with what is going on in the regular classroom. All mainstream programs must be opened up to handicapped students. In particular, there is a need to open up opportunities for handicapped students in vocational schools. Parents whose children are returning to the main stream almost inevitably will focus their attention on how adequate these mainstream opportunities are and how adequately they serve children and youth.

Despite some statements to the contrary, teachers' unions and associations are not opposed to mainstreaming. However, they are setting some very high standards for implementation: decent-sized classes, available support systems, adequate materials for classrooms, and continued professional training. Every one of these demands is correct. Teachers must have adequate support systems and they do need advanced training. I think that large numbers of us who are coming from different streams are finding that we have a great deal to put together. The confluence of energy and interest will pave the way to improved opportunities for the near future.

Conclusion

Public Law 94-142 is changing the philosophy and provisions of education for handicapped students at all levels throughout the United States. The changes are fundamental and portend changes in the processes and structures of education for all students. If education must be individualized for handicapped students, then it is not inconceivable that, in the near future, the benefits of individualization will be extended to all students. And if free, public, appropriate education is provided for handicapped children in the 3-5 and 18-21 age range, then we must face the possibility that such education will be considered the right of all children. If program plans are negotiated with parents of handicapped children, should not this process be extended to the other parents as well? Many observers believe that major changes in the governance of the schools are in prospect, based on the "openers" provided through PL 94-142.

In general, the changes following from PL 94-142 focus on more integrated or inclusive arrangements within the public schools for students who are handicapped. As part of the total change, special educators are in the process of forging a closer working relationship with regular educators which will lead to unification.

Currently, the new procedures for the study, placement, and education of handicapped children according to the provisions of PL 94-142 are running well ahead of changes in the training of school personnel for their new roles.

Educators need leadership in identifying the fundamental aspects of the new policies, organizing the necessary new training programs for school personnel, mounting the serious efforts that are required in institutions of higher education, changing the attitudes of many educators, and changing the structures of our schools. Schools, like ideas, are tested at their margins: today, the margins are at providing equal educational opportunities for children who are handicapped, racially or culturally different, or difficult to teach. Public Law 94-142 makes grand promises; delivering on these promises is an extraordinarily interesting and

complex challenge both to the schools and the universities that prepare personnel for the schools.

It is obviously of great interest and importance, I think, that there should be broad dialogue on these matters of momentous change in attitudes and in structures for the education of handicapped students. The experience in the United States now is that of deep and pervasive change and it appears that trends are similar elsewhere. It remains for us to give details to the movement, to understand it, to evaluate it with care and to renew our commitments to handicapped persons in the context of change.

RESPONSE TO HOUSE BILL 150 AND THE PROPOSED CERTIFICATION STANDARD ON MULTICULTURAL EDUCATION

Henrietta Schwartz
Roosevelt University

Institutional and individual responses to state mandates have common as well as unique elements. Common perceptions, which are the prerequisite to any kind of predictability in group and individual behavior, are based on agreed-upon, implicit or explicit, assumptions. Consequently, it might be useful at this time to make explicit some of the assumptions which prompt support of the two areas under consideration. At the onset, it should be understood that we support the intent of HB 150. We support the inclusion of multicultural education in teacher preparation curricula. However, we have some concerns about the nature and structure proposed for inclusion, implementation, and inspection of programs. We applaud the efforts of the staff in the Teacher Education Program Approval division of the Illinois State Board of Education to explicate the complex issues related to the implementation of HB 150 and their appointment of and work with the Illinois Advisory Committee on Multicultural Education. We are proud of the time and energy Illinois Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, Higher Education Advisory Council and Deans' Grants groups in Illinois have given to the deliberations and responses to both issues. However, we have some concerns about statements in their documents.

The concerns are generated by the basic assumptions about the function of institutions preparing teachers and the purposes of state program approval procedures. Explicitly, we assume:

- that any form of group living and endeavor implies some form of regulation.
- that colleges and universities which are approved to prepare educators

for the public schools have a responsibility to serve the commonweal and, therefore, must expect to function within specified mandates for the common good (e.g., PL 94-142, HB 150, Title IX); in other words, to be regulated.

.. that those institutions which train and certify educators must be law abiding and obey the letter and spirit of the law, or if the law needs changing, to work within the system to make changes.

.. that institutions engaged in knowledge production and transmission, and approved to do so, have a recognized expertise in the preparation of educators.

.. that these institutions have integrity and will do what they promise to do.

.. that these institutions have the expertise and the will to design curricula, obey the law, staff programs, respond to changing needs, and contribute to the common good.

.. that these institutions can continue to produce and disseminate knowledge and train professionals for the changing future only within an atmosphere of flexibility and academic freedom.

.. that it is appropriate that the efforts of these institutions be monitored or "approved" in terms of what they say they are doing in professional preparation programs.

.. that it is appropriate for the state agency to specify the standards and criteria for program approval within the framework of the legislation, the recognition of the expertise of the institutions, the understanding of the delicate balance between academic freedom and legal mandates, and in the spirit of collegiality and trust.

.. that the institutions of higher education recognize the functions and expertise of the professionals in the state program approval agency and

cooperate with their efforts to develop equitable standards and criteria and efficient and effective monitoring procedures.

These assumptions lead to the logical conclusion that in a free, pluralistic, humane society, commonalities and uniqueness will be recognized, respected, and attended to by those agencies charged with the preparation of educators-- state and university in partnership with schools and practitioners. But institutions of higher education must have the flexibility to structure the content and delivery of curriculum within their historical tradition of academic freedom and their recognized responsibility to respond to the laws of the land. Concomitantly, these institutions in Illinois have agreed to systematic and continuous monitoring by the professionals in the state agency and practitioners from the field to maintain their institutional status with "approved programs." Let the state tell us in general terms what is needed for the common good, but then allow us, no, trust us, enough to structure programs and practices which will meet the letter and spirit of PL 94-142, HB 150, and Title IX Standard 7 of the Illinois Manual of Procedures for Approving Illinois Teacher Education Institutions and Programs. If we do not do so, help us remediate; or if compliance is still not achieved, then remove our approved status for programs which are deficient.

Let me comment now on the proposed multicultural standard. My professional activities at the national and state level as an advocate of multicultural education are a source of personal pride. As an anthropologist, the cultural pluralism framework proposed by the Illinois Advisory Council on Multicultural Education warms my heart. But I must support the position of IACTE to reject the addition of yet another multicultural standard, criterion, and review process, first on the grounds of redundancy and second, on the creation of a logical paradox. First, we have a current standard which incorporates the multicultural area. Why another one? Second, the committee wishes to support and encourage "the philosophy of cultural pluralism which not only recognizes the existence

of numerous cultural groups (such as those inhabiting public and private universities), but also promotes their egalitarian existence through fostering respect for their diversity." How is it possible to support diversity by imposing a single standard and a single criterion and a single review process on all seventy or more public and private teacher preparation institutions irrespective of their diversity?

Now, to the complex matter of the implementation of HB 150. To accept the state staff recommendations regarding the implementation of HB 150 (to be in place by September, 1981), puts approved institutions of higher education in jeopardy of violating their contract with students. This contractual agreement concerning certification requirements is stated in the college catalog and constitutes a consumer's guarantee. What of the cases of current graduating students who do not apply for certification until after September, 1981? Are they judged by old or new criteria? Typically, catalog copy says completion of the program guarantees certification. No deadline was given by the state or the catalog. How do we respond to the student who has completed the "approved program" shown in the catalog and is denied certification after September, 1981?

We support the position of options in curriculum design and delivery outlined in the IACTE position statement and the HEAC document, but we resist any attempt to dictate staffing qualifications on the grounds that such a statement implies bad faith and is redundant in light of the state review process which mandates careful scrutiny of staff qualifications by state staff and the visitation team. We resist attempts to specify, except in terms of the legislative mandate, the content and extent of our curriculum for the same reasons stated above, trust amongst professional colleagues and the comprehensive peer/state program approval process.

We all strive for productive, professional preparation programs. Let us avoid the stifling syndrome of legislated curriculum and legislated learning.

GLEANINGS ON MAINSTREAMING: A REPORT OF VISITS TO SEVEN DEAN'S GRANT PROJECTS

Judith C. Burleigh
Roosevelt University

Introduction

During 1979-80, under the auspices of Dean's Grant from the Bureau of Education for the Handicapped, seven faculty members of Roosevelt University's College of Education were selected for retraining in order to assist with the implementation of PL 94-142. The major goal of the project was the examination and revision of the preservice teacher education programs in order that students could be provided with knowledge, attitudes, and strategies for effective teaching in mainstreamed classrooms. One of the many retraining activities was a trip by each faculty fellow to another Dean's Grant project. This paper is an attempt to summarize the findings of seven visits.

Methodology

A set of twelve questions was given to each faculty fellow prior to leaving for what was typically a two day visit. No specific instructions were given regarding the source for the responses. The information was collected from a variety of interviews and from each fellow's observations. The content analysis of the responses became the project of one of the faculty fellows.

Each faculty fellow decided which project to visit. The general guidelines used in the selection process included: projects that were in their second or more year of operation; were located in an urban environment; had a diverse student population in their preservice teacher education program; and had purposes related to the goals of Roosevelt's Dean's Grant project. Additionally, each faculty fellow selected a project which emphasized his/her area of expertise. Examples included an emphasis on secondary education, on testing and counseling, on field placements, and on elementary education. Due to the availability of discount airfare coupons, geographical location was not a limiting factor in the choice of a project to visit.

The set of twelve questions was designed to collect data regarding two general questions: (1) how were other projects attempting to raise the awareness level of their preservice teacher education faculty regarding the education of handicapped children; and, (2)how were preservice teacher education curricula being modified to include the spirit and the specifications of PL 94-142?

Findings

Of the seven projects visited, two did not include the retraining of faculty as a project component. Four projects had faculty as their target population and one had special educators in the field. Those projects designed to retrain faculty either retrained all of their faculty (two projects) or retrained representatives from each subdivision of the teacher education program (two projects). One of the projects which involved retraining all of the faculty also involved all of their undergraduate students. The common element found in the projects with a faculty retraining component was the deliberate effort to involve all areas of teacher education by including all the faculty or representatives of each subdivision. A formal needs assessment was part of three faculty retraining projects and an informal needs assessment was done in one project. No needs assessment was made in one project. Thus it was found that a formal needs assessment was made in three of the five projects which were designed to retrain faculty.

Retraining activities in the five projects included: a three course training program: (1) Resource Specialist Training for Education of Exceptional Children; (2) Administration and Supervision of Education of Exceptional Children; and, (3) Internship in Education of Exceptional Children. A second approach involved the faculty in a task force format to design a competency based curriculum for preservice special education and elementary students. A third retraining activity was that of a "contract" approach, i.e. each faculty member contracted to do a particular retraining activity. The contract approach also involved the faculty in site

visits, interviews with parents, guest speakers, and a "show and tell" retreat to share the projects each had contracted to do. Site visits, presentations by specialists, and the provision of a variety of resource materials were the methods used in the remaining two projects. A comment was added, however, to indicate that the activities considered most successful were those which were shared with teachers in nearby school districts. The sharing component was considered of great value by those who participated. Site visits were evaluated as the most successful activity by one project, and the contract approach by another. It was "too soon to evaluate the most successful activity" for those involved in designing a competency based curriculum. No comment was made concerning the most successful retraining activity in the project with the formal three course structure. Regarding retraining activities, it was found that a variety of types was used and considered as successful by participants.

Technically the Dean is responsible for the activities in a Dean's Grant Project. In each project visited, there was a Project Director and, typically, at least one assistant. The Director or Coordinator was responsible for the broad design of the project with the assistant working with the day by day implementation of the activities. One project had a "program analyst" in charge of evaluation efforts. Two noted that the budget responsibilities were assigned to someone other than the Project Director (another faculty member and an Assistant Dean). Insufficient information was collected to provide a detailed description of staff roles and responsibilities. However, the Dean's role was noted as being "advisory in nature" in one case, and not specifically noted at all in other responses to this question. Thus it was found that the Dean's role in the Dean's Grant Project is a technical role with the implementation aspects of the grant being assigned to, typically, one or two faculty who serve as Grant Director or Coordinator and Assistant.

The documentation methods used in the seven projects were varied. The two

projects which did not include the retraining of faculty used the following documentation methods: a statement of objectives and a discrepancy study; and, the creation of instructional modules, slides, brochures, plus a paper presented at an international conference. Two projects used the creation of a resource collection (a catalog in one project and a central file in the other). One project made videotapes of training sessions, one used the comparison of outputs with intended outputs (competencies of student teachers), and one made documentation the responsibility of each participant (through a contract system). The discrepancy evaluation model was used in two projects but the comparisons were different. In one project the discrepancies identified were between stated objectives and content in specified courses. In the other, the discrepancies identified were between the intended and the actual teaching competencies of student teachers as measured by the rates of learning of their pupils. Thus, it was found that the documentation methods varied to the extent that no common types could be identified.

In response to a question on how the target area for preservice curriculum change was determined, it was found that in one project it was determined by the Dean, in one by State mandate, and in five projects all preservice areas were included as the target areas. In the case of the Dean's decision, the Dean determined that the sophomore students would become the target area within the preservice curriculum. In the State mandate example, it was mandated that the target area be preservice programs. In one project, it was noted that no distinction was made between pre- and inservice. Thus it was found that the target of preservice curriculum change was a common element in all the projects regardless of how it was determined.

Although preservice curriculum examination and revision was an element common to all the projects, the means for effecting it were found to be varied. In one project "heightened awareness of faculty" was the method used. Task forces and/or committees were used in three projects. The complete review of all courses for

the purpose of identifying gaps and overlaps combined with pre- and post-testing was the method noted for both effecting and evaluating curriculum change. In one project it was the defining of the competencies needed for the various roles for which a teacher assumes responsibility that was the method. Federal and State law were noted as the means for effecting curriculum change in one project. Interviews with alumni and writing objectives, plus a retreat for interaction, were used in one of the task format projects. The method of individual contracts was combined with committee work in one project. In the third task force/committee type project, the emphasis was on "cooperative goal setting" as a method for effecting curriculum change. This project advocated a cooperative approach in which children learned to contribute and benefit according to their skills rather than from teaching through competitive grading systems or individualized approaches. The competencies of student teachers using this approach were compared by means of the discrepancy model of outputs compared with intended outputs. (Note: this was the only project visited which included children directly within its design.)

The resources which were made available to Dean's Grant participants were found to be similar in five projects: collections of materials, books, pamphlets, testing instruments, etc. In one project all the participants attended a national conference together. In another project, the collected resources were shared with district teachers. The two projects that did not involve the retraining of faculty made few, if any, resources available, in one project "not any" and in the second "only computer capability." Thus it was found that all of the projects which concentrated on the retraining of faculty provided collections of resource materials to the participants.

The products developed under the auspices of the Dean's Grants were varied with regard to both type and number. It should be noted that the projects visited had been in operation for varying lengths of time. However, it was found that the project design determined whether a variety of products was developed or

whether efforts were concentrated on one. Examples of one product projects include: a resource catalog of mainstreaming sites; a statement of objectives for preservice teacher education; and the specification of common teaching skills and of new undergraduate curricula for implementing them. Projects with several products included the following combinations: (1) collection of resource materials, media library, videotapes, white paper, published article, and the provision of consultants to a Follow-Through workshop; (2) the creation of a test of knowledge about mainstreaming and exceptionality, questionnaire for reviewing curriculum, and a newsletter to faculty and students; and, (3) instructional modules, brochures, slides, and a monograph. One response to the question on products was "improved faculty cooperation."

Dissemination was accomplished by a variety of methods. One project emphasized the "ripple" effect through the faculty. During the first year of operation, approximately one-third of the faculty was involved. During the second year, a second one-third was added with some separate activities and some shared activities with the first group. By the third year, all of the faculty were involved. The desire to become involved in the project increased as knowledge of the retraining activities spread during each year. No effort was made to disseminate in one project. Presentations by participants at a variety of conferences was the method noted for two projects. A newsletter plus informal meetings with teachers in the field were used in one project with the informal meetings considered to be far more effective a means of dissemination than the newsletter. The distribution of a resource catalog was the only means of dissemination for one project. Dissemination was limited to "among ourselves and later to our field-based faculty" in one project. Thus, variety was found concerning both the type and the range of dissemination efforts, with the exception of the project that made no effort.

The responses to the question concerning overall evaluation efforts, either accomplished or in prospect, were varied. Responses included: "the whole process

was evaluative in nature," "must be measured by individual contracts," "will use computer data to determine whether faculty are teaching what is mandated," "will develop a monitoring system," "use test instruments only," "is being developed," and "learner outcomes--will look at rates of learning of handicapped children in regular classrooms using the Consulting Teacher Model developed at the University of Vermont. Based on this we will change the output skills or redesign the training procedures." Although the types varied, the projects shared the common element of making an overall evaluation.

The last of the dozen questions was simply the provision for "other information" relating to the Dean's Grant projects. For two visits, no "other information" was included in the faculty fellow's report. The five remaining reports included the following comments. "Their laboratory school used a multi-age structure, an activity centered curriculum, and emphasized a multi-modal approach to teaching/learning. This was considered appropriate for a mainstreamed classroom." "The democratically arrived at Value Statement seems to have problems with regard to its implementation. Is the implementation of a Value Statement an impossible step in higher education?" "My overall impression is that this project represents evaluation in search of a curriculum." "There seem to be communication problems between the special education faculty and the regular, particularly with regard to the discrepancy model. Also there is difficulty involving the part-time faculty." "Teacher education seems to be a relatively minor operation at this institution, and may be discontinued."

Discussion and Summary

In spite of the aid of a common set of twelve questions, the synthesis of the reports of seven faculty fellows' visits to seven Dean's Grant projects was difficult. There may be errors in the responses due to differing interpretations of the questions as well as those caused by the perceptions of individual observers with differing areas of expertise and interest. This writer may have misinterpreted the written reports of her colleagues, resulting in inaccuracies.

The reader is cautioned that inadvertently misconceptions have been included regarding the projects visited. In addition, acknowledgement is made of the many omissions which might have occurred due to the limited exposure to each project. In spite of these limitations, the reported findings indicate similarities and differences among a group of projects funded for the same common goal: the implementation of PL 94-142.

Among the seven projects visited, similarities found were: (1) a focus on preservice teacher education training with an effort to include all aspects; (2) an emphasis on the examination and revision of curricula; (3) the provision of resources to participants; (4) the development of products; (5) dissemination efforts; and (6) attempts at overall evaluation. In all of the projects the participants were faculty, including the two projects which did not include a faculty retraining component.

The dissimilarities identified among the seven projects were created by the variety of methods used to achieve the similar purposes. The faculty fellows found that other projects were attempting to raise the awareness level of their preservice teacher education faculty regarding the education of handicapped children by: site visits, presentations by specialists, providing a collection of resources on mainstreaming, a three course sequence of formal courses, individually contracted projects, designing a competency based curriculum, developing a statement of objectives, writing instructional modules, and using retreats for some of the activities. In the two projects in which faculty retraining was not a component, the level of awareness of the educational needs of handicapped children may be assumed to have been raised by the process of developing a statement of objectives and designing instructional modules. It is not possible to separate the raising of the awareness level of faculty from the process of curriculum examination and revision because the former is a by-product of the latter.

Dissimilarities were noted in the variety of methods used for effecting

curriculum change. These methods varied from raising the awareness level of the faculty to the creation of competency based curricula implemented in the field and evaluated by measuring the learning rates of handicapped children in regular classroom settings. Only one project considered the raising of the awareness level as sufficient means to effect curriculum change. All the others included some form of redesigned curricula ranging from a statement of objectives to a completed sequence of courses. Faculty involvement patterns ranged from individual contracts to committees and/or task forces to the total faculty at a retreat. The force for change ranged from federal and state mandates, to decision of the Dean, to decisions of the faculty. The variety of methods used to effect curriculum change were reflected in both the variety of products produced in the process, and the variety of approaches to the overall evaluation of the projects. The seven projects visited provide an example of how common purposes may be achieved by a variety of approaches. There is no one way participants can learn by sharing the many ways with each other. As a retraining activity for faculty, visits to other Dean's Grant Projects may be rated as highly effective. In addition to the responses to questions, the gleanings from the visits by the faculty fellows included bibliographies on mainstreaming; suggestions for guest lecturers; samples of needs assessment and evaluation instruments; respect for the variety of ways to achieve common goals; and an intensified motivation to fulfill the spirit and specifications of PL 94-142.

To date, direct outcomes from the visits include: (1) a Course Emphasis study which used a method adapted from Drake University and, (2) a proposal for funds to establish a "catalog" of mainstreamed clinical teaching sites submitted by a consortium of four private colleges and universities in Chicago to the Illinois State Board of Education as a consequence of the visit to San Francisco State University.

The Projects visited were;

Bank Street College of Education, New York City

Drake University, Des Moines, Iowa

Fordham University, New York City

University of Nebraska at Omaha

San Francisco State University

Simmons College, Boston, and

Southern Methodist University, Dallas, Texas

DOCUMENTATION AND EVALUATION

George Olson
Roosevelt University

Introduction

In federally funded projects such as the Dean's Grant, the purposes of project evaluation exist on at least two levels. The broader level includes reasons which apply to most externally funded projects: to insure the quality of projects that are to be disseminated, to increase efficiency in producing these projects, and to improve the management and decision making processes through which programs are planned and implemented. Ultimately, most evaluations seek to determine whether intentions are realized and whether a minimal level of standards has been upheld. All of the above reside in an overall focus for evaluation; to enhance success and minimize failure.

The more specific level involves those goals and objectives which a project states it will accomplish. Did the project accomplish what it set out to do, and, if not, to what extent were the intended objectives accomplished? It is generally expected also that reasons are provided for lack of accomplishments. If the broad purposes stated above are fulfilled, the evaluation can produce data useful for making judgements of success and for making decisions concerning project goals and purposes. If the specific purposes are satisfied, data are produced that are potentially most useful to project assessments of program, growth and success with respect to individual project criteria.

Reflecting the diversity among universities operating Deans' Grants projects, the projects themselves are diverse. While there are national guidelines and general goals for all projects, the specific project objectives vary considerably across projects. As a consequence, the Discrepancy Evaluation Model (DEM) is suggested as a method of addressing the evaluation needs of a Dean's Grant project, while at the same time permitting the project to assess its own growth based upon

local criteria.

The DEM assumes that the project has not emerged without a large degree of planning and that this planning activity has been conducted for the express purpose of reaching some stated objectives. When individuals involved in the project adequately perform the planned activities and reach their intended goals, they accomplish what they initially proposed ought to have been accomplished. To the extent that proposed activities and objectives are not fulfilled as originally intended, there exists a discrepancy between what ought to have been accomplished and what in reality was accomplished. It is this difference -- between real accomplishments and those originally intended (the oughts) -- that defines the discrepancy for this model of evaluation. For a Dean's Grant project, completion of national and locally designed objectives within a specified time frame constitutes the "oughts."

At the outset information is needed concerning the intended activities and objectives that ought (ideally) to be accomplished, a list of the individuals participating, and a time frame for completion of the events of the project. The information gathered from the project represents a set of baseline data from which a sample monitoring instrument can be constructed. From the data collected, activities can be drawn out and listed that represent the first year of the project. Columns have been included that indicate the status of completion of these activities. Space has been left for the addition of other objectives and activities not represented and an estimated completion date is required of each activity. It is intended, therefore, that a common instrument such as this can be constructed for each project year and distributed at the beginning of the year for project staff to use as a planning and monitoring tool for the year's activities. Staff of the project will have the advantage of seeing "core" activities from each year and will be able to indicate an estimated completion date for their project. They are also able to add those objectives which arise during the project, to assign them letters and a completion date

as well. Once this process is completed -- and this may take considerable planning effort -- it constitutes an abbreviated project plan.

Such a monitoring procedure will facilitate periodic self-evaluation by project staff. Such methods should increase useful communication, should provide information concerning growth and accomplishment, and should help to facilitate any assistance that projects at the local level may need in time for such assistance to be effective.

To increase the richness of the data gathered, projects can add a brief demographic report of their project and indicate any major changes in their program structure or components when they respond periodically to the instrument. Also included is a section in which they can respond in written form concerning any additional information about their project that they wish to report such as positive accomplishments, unintended outcomes, concerns, or unusual circumstances.

At the end of each year, discrepancy scores can be computed for the project by year of operation. The lower the discrepancies for the objectives and activities at the end of the year, the higher are the indicated accomplishment levels of the project. Such reporting should aid identification of particular strengths and weaknesses of the project as well as report an accurate picture of exactly what activities took place generally across the project. The report can be used for self-comparison purposes and for planning for the upcoming year.

Each year of operation would provide more data for instrument refinement. No doubt, changes will occur from year to year, ones that already can be anticipated given current evaluation data. Also indicated, however, would be how a first year project, for example, changes over the years as defined by those objectives that are written in by the first year project when in the process of developing the initial plan (the first time they fill out the instrument). Such "change" data would be invaluable at the regional and national level for evaluation and planning purposes on a wider scale.

In summary, the evaluation scheme proposed is being suggested for use based

upon considerable discussion and analysis of the data presently available from Deans' Grants projects. The limitations of the usefulness of these data has revealed the need for a more comprehensive scheme that gathers data periodically and reveals individual growth of local projects. One of the key stumbling blocks in a once per year assessment of project accomplishment resides in the diversity of project activities and in the diversity of the institutions conducting Deans' Grants programs. The suggested scheme, while easily administered and maintained once it is in place, will satisfy these complex needs with a minimal local project effort. The information provided will have high utility at local, regional and national levels in terms of describing specific and general accomplishment of projects on a yearly basis. As proposed, the scheme should greatly increase the usefulness of the data gathered for all levels of project functioning.

PROPOSAL FOR A CLINICAL EXPERIENCE

RESOURCE CATALOGUE IN SPECIAL EDUCATION

Bernard Sherman
Roosevelt University

I. Growing Importance of Special Education in Teacher Education And at Roosevelt University

The recent history of schooling in the United States has seen several waves of ferment caused by growing public awareness of past oversights and discrimination. The first of these coming in the late 1950's after a period of relative somnolence, was the effort to strengthen schooling in the sciences and mathamatics as a late outcome of the cold war. The second was a technological thrust occasioned by the availability of new electronic inventions and the quest for new markets by corporations which saw publishers' sales to school districts as an untapped market. These were the results of recognized oversights. The third wave reflected a willingness of the American public to support improved education for poor minorities. This was accompanied in a short time by a growing complex of court decisions and increasingly active federal agencies such as the Office of Civil Rights, the Equal Employment Opportunities Commission, and the Justice Department.

The effect of this activity was to develop more awareness of the rights of parents and children, both in and out of school, in the areas of due process, racial and other types of discrimination, free speech, child advocacy, and legal processes for juveniles. Finally, coming out of this was a movement by the parents of handicapped adults and children to secure in law and official action improved services in a spectrum that includes transportation, public facilities, discrimination in employment, due process, and schooling.

The chief impetus for actions to improve education for the handicapped is federal Public Law 94-142, "The Education of All Handicapped Children." This law has important application to teacher education, although it does not

specifically mention it, since it emphasizes as a major thrust the necessity of placing handicapped children in the "least restrictive environment," a phrase popularly known as "mainstreaming." Since this means that teachers of normal, that is nonhandicapped children, increasingly will be teachers of handicapped children of all kinds for increasing amounts of time and sometimes entirely, it devolves upon the trainers of teachers, both inservice and preservice, to prepare teachers for this new role. Evidence that special training is needed is found in the unabashed dismay expressed by teachers as the new responsibility has been thrust upon them. Examination of teacher education curricula assuredly will reveal that teaching of the handicapped, a field known as special education, is a missing content. There is a strong field of special education, but efforts in teacher training have been limited to preparation of specialists of various categories. In summary, department and colleges of teacher education will have to restructure their curricula in teacher education to prepare all teachers to deal with special children.

In the State of Illinois, this effort will be given encouragement by the recent passage by the General Assembly of H.B.150, which requires that starting September 1, 1981, every applicant for a teaching certificate must have received instruction in identification, psychology, and instruction of special children including but not limited to the learning disabled.

II. Role of Clinical Experiences in Teacher Education

Along with these developments in the field of special education has come a recent increase in the importance in teacher education of the clinical or field experience components of the perservice program. The recent adoption by the Illinois State Board of Education of a document of rules and regulations governing the implementation of clinical experiences in certificate programs offered by teacher training institutions has created a new set of problems for state colleges

of education. Heretofore, colleges were free to determine the curriculum and mode of supervision of clinical experiences and student teaching courses; starting in January, 1980, the state assumed the responsibility of dictating that 100 clock hours of student pre-teaching experiences would be provided for each student. It requires that these experiences, which might include perhaps up to a third of the hours in vicarious activities such as micro-teaching, examination of curriculum material, and campus follow-up discussions of visits, be closely supervised by the college faculty, and be supported by a system of documentation and appraisal of the performance of the student in the clinical experience.

These increased, more complex, and more controlled clinical experiences represent a new challenge to coordinators of clinical experiences, faculty designers of curriculum, and college supervisors: to expand the clinical sites, train site cooperating teachers (also a state requirement), engage with the sites in curriculum design, and control the sequence of experiences that the student would encounter at the site. Such activities are as detailed and extensive for the small college with one hundred students as they are for the large state university with several hundred students since the same design, structure, and documentation have to be planned regardless of the number of students.

It can be said that the instruction of the regular teacher candidates under Public Law 150 will be strengthened if it includes a clinical experience. The College of Education of Roosevelt University has adopted such a requirement for its elementary education students already.

With these new students (and all students in special education programs requiring the greater part of their state required 100 clock hours of clinical experiences, i.e. field courses prior to a student teaching course), all observing and participating in schools with special education pupils, it is possible to make predictions about immediate needs in the field: 1) More placement sites will be needed. 2) Effective mainstreaming sites will be at a premium, particularly in

districts which present an articulated policy or philosophy of mainstreaming. 3) Experiences with any of the spectrum of disabilities such as emotionally disturbed, learning disabled, and mentally handicapped can be presumed to be instructive for all students, but colleges will have to develop some kind of scheme to determine which placement is suitable for which college student and why. Experience at Roosevelt has shown in its secondary education program that students who seek out placements in student teaching with troubled youth under court supervision, for example, have felt their experience to be very valuable. This is probably related to the type of student who seeks this out. 4) A more structured approach to special education clinical experiences is needed to supply research to the unanswered questions of just what contribution clinical experiences make to teacher education, what mix, and how much.

III. The Secondary Education Cooperative

The College of Education of Roosevelt University, as part of a Secondary Education Cooperative which also includes DePaul University, Loyola University, and Mundelein College, has submitted a proposal to the Illinois Board of Higher Education under the Higher Education Cooperative Act for fiscal year 1981. The Cooperative seeks to establish a secondary exchange which will perform a variety of functions to improve clinical experiences at the four institutions. Some of these are closely related to the special education curriculum component mandated under Public Law 94-142. Specifically included are the codification of special education clinical experiences (among other kinds of placements) and research activities. The research catalog aspect is detailed as follows:

> "The first outcome of this enterprise will be a resource catalog of available and appropriate secondary education clinical experience sites in the Chicago metropolitan area. The catalog should include: the location of the site; name of the contact person; a brief description of the kind of experiences offered; a classification of the experiences by subject matter, type of student population, and level of involvement; a schedule for the site; possible relationships between the experiences and

concepts developed in university courses; and the commitments which are being made by the universities to the site as well as the commitments made by the site to the universities. No site will be included unless some form of contractual arrangements among the four institutions and the site have been agreed upon.

In order to produce such a catalog, it will be necessary to identify a wide variety of potential sites, develop a data gathering system, organize visits to the site by college faculty, enter into agreements with each site, and develop a system for updating information. These activities should be completed by December 1, 1980, so that a catalog can be printed and distributed at the beginning of January, 1981.

Use of the catalog by the colleges must then follow. This will require that Center staff maintain contact with cooperating sites and college faculty, schedule student placements by the different colleges, and monitor and evaluate the placements."[1]

IV. Dean's Grant Program At San Francisco State University

In late February, 1980, the Dean's Grant Program at San Francisco State University was visited. The program in progress at that time, operated under the aegis of the department of special education, is called the resource specialist program. It consists of a series of courses offered to special education teachers for the purpose of giving them the skills to serve as resource specialist, a new category of expert being considered by the California legislature to assist local districts to effectuate the provisions of PL 94-142, especially mainstreaming. A related second Dean's Grant proposal, already submitted by them. utilizes the services of the resource specialist to students and other graduate students in the special education department for an activity which sheds some light on the resource catalog activity. This proposal calls for the development of a resource catalog of mainstreaming programs of school districts in the Bay Area of San Francisco. The book would serve as a resource for students and other interested parties who desire to study in the field examples of effective strategies and programs for mainstreaming children. One gets the impression that school districts in the San

---

[1] A proposal to the Higher Education Cooperative Act entitled "Chicago Secondary Education Cooperative (CSTEC)," p. 4.

Francisco area are further along in introducing mainstreaming scheduling than are those in the Chicago metropolitan area.

The chief lesson to be learned from the preliminary experiences of San Francisco State is that such an undertaking is an onerous, major one. Early contacts with school districts indicate some degree of wariness or even unwillingness to cooperate. There are reasons that can be surmised to explain a less than total enthusiasm on the part of school districts to cooperate in a compilation of information by a neutral party about themselves. These districts are required to perform a great many new tasks in the process of performing their normal responsibilities, namely, the provision of educational offerings to children within their purview.

Study of the lengthy federal guidelines that accompany PL 94-142 or the Illinois State Board of Education rules and regulations that relate to treatment of handicapped children shows that they posit an elaborate web of legalistic requirements, subject to a bureaucratic review by the state. School districts are obliged to follow procedures of screening; testing of various kinds; notification to parents (in foreign languages to parents that are willing to conduct their other dealings with government in English or through translations that they obtain or by simple neglect); and community dissemination of information. All this is to be done with elaborate, legalistic documentation to prove, presumably to courts and state inspectors, that the districts have not been derelict. This seems clearly to be an adversary operation with the state and federal governments considering themselves the advocates of a special interest group to which they are responding and the school district having thrust upon it the role of repentant victimizer. It is in this atmosphere that an independent institution sets out to gather still more documentation for its own use.

Another learning to be garnered from the experience at San Francisco State is that some sort of annotation is essential in an extensive documentation. Blind leads have to be explored when dozens or more examples are being listed. This is

the writer's experience in using the listing of special education schools provided by the Bureau of Handicapped Citizens. The plan at San Francisco State calls for the employment of graduate students as annotators who will visit the school districts to gather information and make a commentary about the program.

V. Catalog Of Bureau Of Handicapped Citizens

The Chicago Metropolitan area has available to it a new catalog entitled Directory of Services for Handicapped Children and Adults. It lists agencies and public and private schools that offer services to the complete spectrum of handicapped children and adults in the region, with the additional listing of a number of schools in the midwest. The listings were evidently gathered by a mailing to whatever names were known or could be gathered by the umbrella agency. In some cases no response is listed so the codification is omitted. The incidence of no responses is extremely low, an indication of the high reputation that the Bureau enjoys. The codification system is explained in a key at the front of the book. It is a simple, useful one. No annotation is attempted. In a sense, the codification is a form of shorthand, summary comment. The alphabetical page entry includes the following information:

Number
(Indicates the agency's location in the alphabetical list.)

Name of Agency
Address
Telephone Number
Handicaps Served (The types of handicapped persons served, starting with the highest priority for the agency.)

Blind/Partially Sighted - B/PS
Deaf/Partial Hearing - B/PH
Emotionally Disturbed - ED
Health Impaired - HI
Learning Disabled - LD
Mentally Retarded - MR
Multiply Handicapped - MH
Physically Handicapped - PH
Speech Disabled - SD
Underachievers - U
Some - S (Indicates that the agency serves primarily non-handicapped, but accepts some handicapped clients)

Ages
Type of Agency
- Community Living Facility
- Day Care Facility
- Homebound Service
- Information and Referral
- Medical Hospital
- Parent/Consumer Organization
- Psychiatric Hospital
- Recreation
- Rehabilitation
- Respite Care
- Sheltered Workshop

Fees
Georgraphic Area Served

PLEASE NOTE:
1) Agencies beginning with "Mc" or "Mac" appear as they fall naturally in the alphabetical order.
2) "No Response" means no response was received to the questionnaire sent to elicit information for the Directory.
3) Agencies underlined are either large agencies with branches or hospitals.

This catalog can serve as an illustration of an excellent scheme for this kind of manual. The missing ingredients that make an additional resource necessary are:

1) Public school districts, which form the largest body of exemplars, are omitted.
2) No annotation is attempted.

VI. Considerations

An additional commentary should be made about the need for a resource catalog. At the present time, each college maintains an office of field experiences with a director who is invariably a professional, a professor of education in most cases. Past practices in this area have dictated the existence of such an office with the charge of locating suitable sites for student teaching, a course with a long and honorable history, based as it is on the apprenticeship system. The recent moves by the state serve to strengthen the need for a professional level office because they increase and codify the responsibilities, making it impossible for a non-professional to perform the functions. Examples to support this point are the requirement to train the staffs of the cooperating schools, to negotiate a contract

with the district, and to involve the district personnel in modifying and planning the teacher education program of the departments of education of institutions of higher education. The inefficient and laborious part of these duties lies in the preliminary exploring of the possible sites. This task is generally performed independently by each college, with the director-coordinator enlisting the aid of his faculty and with some informal inter-institutional sharing of information as different college faculties meet at professional associations, etc. Obviously, much duplication of effort occurs. The availability of a resource catalog would ensure, at least, that unassessed raw data such as the kinds of special education categories offered in a school would not be sought out over and over again.

Even more valuable would be the annotations, the remarks that might reveal the educational philosophy of the district, its instructional strategies, possibly the levels of training and types of certification of the staff. Another needed type of information is the general description of the pattern of services of the school: nurse and auxiliary medical services; types of medical, social, educational and neurological tests.

Many school districts maintain a fact book with information about the community including available resources. These could be edited with some extrapolations included in the catalog proper or as appendices.

While much data can be gathered from existing sources or by telephone and mail survey, a body of information still remains available only to a school caller who elicits personal cooperation. School districts devote most of their energies to filling out forms for central offices, supervising agencies, or source of funding. This task has increased markedly in recent years. The role of school visitor can be filled by the Director-Coordinator of Field Experiences, college supervisors, or graduate students. Undergraduates also should be gathering data as they train to become acute school observers, but their information must be closely monitored. In all cases, care must be taken to protect the privacy of individuals, particularly

pupils and parents. All school visitors who collect data for publication should be provided with a guidebook or style book, a compendium of principles or rules to indicate what restrictions must be followed about types of questions that may be asked and what may be published. An obvious example would be prohibition of last names and other identifying information of clients and pupils. A necessity may be a written consent form to be completed for each school or district that consents to cooperate in the gathering and dissemination of data about its program.

VII. Publics For Catalog

It has been indicated that offices of field experience throughout the Chicago region will have use for a resource catalog of special education placement suitable for college student observations. Academicians of various persuasions might also find uses for the catalog. Demographers, educators, psychologists of a clinical bent, local school district officials, sociologists, legislative staff workers, mental health workers, and journalists might turn to the catalog either as a resource for patient, or client reference, or for data for research studies. Statistics about special education will be increasingly valuable as more and more interest grows in this field in the future.

PROPOSED OUTLINE OF SITE RECORD FORM

District _____

School or Institution _____

Sponsor, agency, or public administration _____

Address _____

Contact Person _____

Telephone Number _____

Code listing of type(s) of education and services offered (See code of Directory of Services for Children and Handicapped Adults for example).

_____

Classes or activities which can be visited (Exact time and location should be verified before visit).

_____

_____

_____

_____

Annotative commentary

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

Permissions on file? _____